A REPLY

TO A

LETTER,

ADDRESSED TO

MAJOR SCOTT WARING,

&c. &c.

Scott Waring (John

5

13

A REPLY

TO A

LETTER,

ADDRESSED TO

"JOHN SCOTT WARING, Esq."

IN REFUTATION

OF THE

ILLIBERAL AND UNJUST OBSERVATIONS,

AND STRICTURES

OF THE

ANONYMOUS WRITER OF THAT LETTER.

By MAJOR SCOTT WARING.

'Not only do these Anti-Moral Missionaries exert themselves at home, but every effort which the ardour of fanaticism and vanity can inspire, is employed to evangelize the Heathen, as it is called; and not only are the more opulent of their deluded followers stripped, but even the poorest among them are plundered, to support the expense of Foreign Missions conducted in that spirit of ignorant, and ill-directed enthusiasm, which the Scripture expressly reprobates as a zeal without knowledge."

"Hints to the Public and the Legislature on the Nature and Effect of Evangelical Preaching." By a *Barrister*.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. RIDGWAY, 170, PICCADILLY,

OPPOSITE BOND STREET.

1808.

W. Flint, Printer, Old Bailey.

AC 911.1808.S38

PRIAULX LIBRARY GUERNSEY

PREFACE.

THE following Reply has been delayed a few days, in consequence of the critique that appeared in the last Number of the Christian Observer, on which are inserted a few Remarks; and this afternoon a copy of Mr. Fuller's "Apology for Christian Missions," and one of the last Number of the Eclectic Review were left at my house. Whether it be to Mr. Fuller or to some other gentleman that I am thus obliged, I take this opportunity of returning my thanks.

Mr. Fuller, in his Apology, has put, *beyond the possibility of future doubt,* the correctness of the private information that I had received, by publishing the following extracts from Mr. Carey's Letters.

" India swarms with Deists, and Deists are in my opinion the most intolerant of mankind. Their great desire is to exterminate true religion from the earth; I consider *the alarms which have been spread through India,* as the fabrication of these men.

On the 13th of February 1807, Mr. Carey writes, " A number of persons were preparing to embark for Europe, *with a view to spread the alarm at home.*

After reading these extracts, no person I presume will in future venture to say that "*an alarm was not spread through India* in 1806,

and 1807, relative to Missionaries. Mr. Fuller has the same right to suppose the alarm was ill-founded as I have to believe it was a very well-founded alarm.

The alarm most assuredly was entertained both by the King's Governor of Ceylon, and the Governor-General and Council of Bengal, or the former would not have expelled every Missionary from that island, nor would the latter have laid the Missionaries and their native converts under such restrictions as they did lay them in August 1806.

It is a most extraordinary assertion of Mr Carey, that in February 1807, a number of persons were coming home, *with a view to spread the alarm here.* They were coming home, some because after a long residence in India, they had acquired competent fortunes,—others from ill health, and others upon furlough; but no man

will believe that a single gentleman came home, for the purpose of spreading in England the alarm which prevailed in India.

Amongst the Deists with which India abounds by Mr. Carey's account, he must include the Governor of Ceylon, and the Governor-General and Council of Bengal, because *they* have very effectually opposed the plans of the Missionaries.

Peterborough-house,
Fulham,
9th Feb. 1806.

A REPLY

TO THE

LETTER

ADDRESSED TO

JOHN SCOTT WARING, ESQ.

A LETTER has been printed which some gentleman who says he has been twenty years in India, has addressed to me. I read it with the utmost attention, in the hope and expectation of meeting some information of importance. A gentleman who has resided twenty years in India, if he has lately returned from that country, ought to be listened to with attention.

But this gentleman is really so palpably of the school of the furious and implacable John Calvin, that until he favours me with his name, I must continue to think that he never crossed the line himself, though with respect

to recent transactions at Madras, he has received from good authority, some important information, and for communicating it to me, I am much obliged to him.

With the exception of that part, which contains this information, the remainder of his letter consists of the most virulent personal abuse, and of a bungling attempt to prove an inconsistency between one part of the preface and a part of the observations, which those who read my letter to the Reverend Mr. Owen, will, I am confident, find fully explained. For a motto to his letter, the gentleman has taken a quotation from the gospel:

"Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee."

And the proof resolves itself into this. That in *July* I conceived Missionaries however numerous in India could do no mischief if they were pure in their morals, and of inoffensive characters. That in *December*, having discovered they were not inoffensive, I proposed their recal as a measure of political prudence.

But from a gentleman who had been twen-

ty years in India, I should have expected a fair and honest opinion on the following points.

1st, Whether it is practicable or not to convert the immense population of Indostan to Christianity.

2d, Whether the measures latterly taken by English Missionaries, may not, if persisted in, prove highly injurious to the state.

3d, Whether there is, or is not a political necessity for removing these Missionaries from India, for prohibiting all persons dependent on the company from being concerned in printing, or in gratuitously circulating, our Holy Scriptures and religious tracts amongst the natives of India.

4th, Whether it be or be not necessary to direct, by positive orders from England, that Drs. Buchanan and Kerr, and all the clergy of the Church of England in India, shall in future confine themselves to the performance of the duty for which they are paid by the Company—The moral and religious improvement of British subjects.

But to avoid any discussion on these points, in which the sentiments of a man who had been twenty years in India would indeed be very valuable, this gentleman expresses his *suspicions*, that I "have no religion at all," and in various other parts of his letter, he strongly insinuates that I am a Catholic. Supposing him to be right in the first or the second suspicion, what possible influence ought my religious opinions to have, in the determination of the preceding questions.

It is indeed curious to consider the manner in which my arguments have been answered by my opponents.

The Reverend Mr. Owen accuses me of not wishing to spare Christianity. The "Proprietor" says that though I profess to have some regard for the Scriptures, I appear to know very little about them. The "Christian," that I have abused and blasphemed our Holy Scriptures. The Christian Observer, that I am an adept in the school of Voltaire, and recommend to the nation to crush Christianity in India. The Evangelical Magazine, that my language is the language of Satan himself; and this gentleman, who says he has

been twenty years in India, brings up the rear, by declaring his suspicions that I have no religion at all in the first instance, then he says I have mentioned our Holy Scriptures with levity, and in many places he insinuates that I am a Catholic.

A Catholic is a Christian, and surely I had better be of a religion professed by four millions of his majesty's subjects, than to have, *no religion at all.* But I have made a true and an honest confession of my faith, in my letter to the Reverend Mr. Owen.

I am a Protestant of the good old Church of England, I retain the opinions I held in 1766, when I first went to India. At that time I never heard Mr. Whitfield, Mr. Wesley, or Mr. Romaine, described otherwise than as Methodists in holy orders, not as sound orthodox divines of the Church of England.

In those days the terms, evangelical and gospel clergyman, vital Christianity, evangelizing, and christianizing were not, as far as I know, in use amongst men. If the gentleman will please to peruse a Pamphlet lately published by Mr. Hatchard, written by

a Barrister, on the effects of Evangelical Preaching, he will find my sentiments exactly expressed, though in far more elegant and classical language than I am master of. The gentleman is pleased to say, "that the only wish of my heart is to gratify resentments."

This is malignant nonsense. What resentments can I have to gratify? Is there any thing of violence, or personality in the language of the Preface, or the pamphlet? I speak of the public conduct of men whom I name, and I point out such parts of their public conduct, as I think highly dangerous to the state. Unless from the facts that I have brought forward in support of my opinion, those who govern India, should think as I do, all I have said will go for nothing. I have been twenty-six years in England, and what resentment can I have against men whom I never saw. This gentleman puts me down as "a patriot," evidently meaning that by the line I have taken, I wish to advance my consequence or my fortune. If he knew me *at all*, he would know that I breathe with difficulty for half the year, have been compelled from that circumstance to quit London, and am unable to discharge the duties of any public situation.

Let the reader take the following as a specimen of the candour of this gentleman, who says he has been *twenty years in India.*

" But not content with the efforts you had made to injure the Bible Society, by vilifying their acts in India, yet, as if you felt a secret monitor within, warning you that the shaft recoiled on yourself, you fly off to South America, and represent that either the *British or Foreign* Bible Society, had sent a Missionary to Buenos Ayres, as soon as they heard of the capture of that city, which you assert was a most flagrant violation of public faith. What proof have you?"

This gentleman seems not to know that the designation of the Society is, the British *and* foreign Bible Society, not *two* Societies but *one.* There is another Bible Society, of which I know nothing.

What I stated was as follows:

" Buenos Ayres is a very sore subject at present. To send a Missionary there, which *one of the Societies did,* as soon as they heard of the capture of that city, was a

most flagrant violation of the public faith; as such it must have appeared to his Majesty's ministers; and therefore I *presume* the man was smuggled out in one of the unfortunate merchant ships. The place was recaptured, and he waited the event of General Whitelocke's operations. *The British and Foreign Bible Society,* had we regained possession of Buenos Ayres, would *equally* have violated the public faith, by sending bibles in the Spanish or American language to that city. It surrendered on articles, one of which was the free exercise of the Catholic religion."

If the gentleman was twenty years in India either in the civil or military service of the Company, he ought to be able to form an opinion on this point. Instead of giving his opinion, he asks me what proof I have? What proof can I have but of the fact, that the Missionary was sent out? According to my judgment, the act was a violation of the public faith. If he thinks it was not, why hesitate to say so at once?

Does he mean to dispute *the* fact, that a Missionary Society did send a Missionary to Buenos Ayres?

I state that one of the societies sent a *Missionary* to Buenos Ayres. What society could I mean but a Missionary Society? The British and Foreign Bible Society send out no Missionaries, and the fact would have been clear, even had I not added that the British and Foreign Bible Society would have *equally* violated the public faith had *they* sent *Bibles* translated into the Spanish or American languages *to Buenos Ayres,* had it been recaptured by our troops.

I discovered the fact by a perusal of the Report of the "Missionary Society," as it is called, printed last year. I conceived that his majesty's ministers were ignorant of this extraordinary transaction, I can now say positively that they were ignorant of it. But how can the government of this country be carried on if an *imperium in imperio* is to be thus erected, and if a number of individuals in London are to take upon themselves, as soon as they hear of the conquest of the most bigotted Catholic city upon earth perhaps, to send *a Protestant Missionary* to that city, without the consent or knowledge of his Majesty's ministers.

If the gentleman will send for the last Report of "the Missionary Society," he will read four

sermons, one of them preached by Mr. Griffin of Portsea, who appears to be a man of very considerable talents indeed—another by a Dr. Draper, which is quite in the style of the sermons preached by Hugh Peters and other Puritans, in the latter part of Charles the First's reign. He may read letters from the Missionaries employed by this Society on the coast of Coromandel, and in the island of Ceylon until the king's governor sent them away from that island. It was from these letters that I concluded the Coast and the Bengal Missionaries did not at all differ, in the mode of exercising their missionary functions. There he will find the Report of their proceedings, in sending out a Protestant Missionary to Buenos Ayres; but lest he should not take the trouble of sending for the publication, I will transcribe the following passage from the Report of the Directors of the Missionary Society.

"When the Directors heard that in the course of Divine Providence, the populous and important town of Buenos Ayres had become a part of the British empire, they were desirous of seizing *the first opportunity*, of sending *thither* the invaluable treasure of the Gos-

pel of Christ. They saw with what avidity the British merchants extended their commercial schemes in that country, and they felt anxious to communicate, with at least an equal zeal, the superior benefits, *of a pure* religion. Mr. Creighton, one of the Missionary students. was therefore dispatched in the ship Spring Grove to that station. It was not expected that he could immediately discharge all the duties of a Missionary, as the prejudices and interests *of the Catholic* ecclesiastics might present a powerful obstacle; but it was hoped that while employed in learning the language of the country, he would be acquiring the most useful information of the state of religion, and the way in which he might best employ himself, and others, who might hereafter be sent among the native Heathen; it was also hoped that he might be of essential use to the sick among our British soldiers, and be serviceable in the religious instruction of their children.

"The Society need not be informed, that before the fleet of merchant-men arrived, Buenos Ayres had reverted to its former possessors; and the particular door of usefulness which had been opened, was for the present closed. When Mr. Greighton arrived in the Rio de la

Plata, and received this afflictive intelligence, he was at a loss how to act; but after due deliberation, he prudently determined to wait there till he should see in what manner depending affairs would terminate. Since that time, Monte Video, another considerable town in the vicinity, has yielded to the British arms, and Mr. Creighton, it is hoped, will now enjoy an opportunity of rendering some useful services to the general cause of religion in that part of the new world. It was natural for Mr. Creighton earnestly to wish for the help of a colleague, in his remote and arduous station; but, however desirous the Directors were to comply with his wishes, prudence requires them to defer this measure for the present, especially as no student could be conveniently spared."

The gentleman will not now say, "if one was sent." The next question is, "How was the sending out such Missionary a breach of public faith?" I have already said, that the city surrendered *upon articles*, one of which was the free exercise of the Catholic religion, the religion *they* professed; and to send a Protestant Missionary, without the consent of the Spanish government *was*, I think, a breach of public faith. It struck me when I read it as

an act of insanity also, because from having been three months in South America, I know the bigotted attachment of the American Spaniards and their native converts to the Catholic religion. But the gentleman will not yet let me escape. I noticed what the general and the admiral had said as to the hatred which the Spaniards bore to us, and it was very natural for me to say, that if the Spaniards knew that we had brought a Protestant Missionary amongst them, there was no circumstance so likely to cause that hatred. But this in the gentleman's opinion, was a very serious crime in me. I might have enquired. Of whom? I did not know a single person, who had arrived from Buenos Ayres, prior to the publication of the Preface; and if I had, I was ill and confined at a cottage in Old Brompton while I was writing the Preface. But to shew the sort of temper with which the gentleman has dwelt upon trivial circumstances, in order to avoid the discussion of those which only are important, I will ask him, had I been able to go about, what information could I have procured? Were the officers who first arrived, acquainted with the cause from which the hatred of the Spaniards originated? Those who have since arrived, only know that the fact is so, and a

rational man must suppose that to send a Protestant Missionary to a Catholic country, was the most provoking and insulting act that ever was committed by a nation possessing common sense.

By sending out a Protestant Missionary to Buenos Ayres, the Directors of the Missionary Society betrayed their ignorance and folly, but they displayed also a contempt of the authority of the King. No merchant ship sailed until a trade to Buenos Ayres was sanctioned by an Order of Council, no Sectarian Missionary ought to have sailed, unless the consent of his Majesty's ministers had been previously obtained. A school-boy could have told these Directors that in propagating Christianity in South America, millions of lives had been sacrificed, but that at present all the inhabitants of Buenos Ayres, and as far as the authority of the Spanish Government extends, are the most bigotted and ignorant Catholics upon earth, except the inhabitants of the Brazils, and they do not exceed them in bigotry, and in ignorance.

Two of the Directors of the Missionary Society are the Rev. Rowland Hill, and the Rev.

George Burder, the members as far as I can discover are Sectarians. Amongst the subscribers I do not find the name of one of the prelates or dignitaries of the Church of England, nor does it appear from the account of their receipts and disbursements, that they have received the least pecuniary assistance from either the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, or from the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, although I believe these respectable Societies did afford some pecuniary assistance formerly to the Danish Missionaries in India. This Sectarian Society maintains thirteen Missionaries on the Coast, and in Ceylon, and one at Surat. Three of the number are women.

The gentleman triumphantly asks me, " How was the sending out such Missionary, *if one was sent*, a flagrant breach of the public treaty? Where are your proofs? *You have none.* And this, I am constrained to repeat, is the winding up *of all your assertions.*" This gentleman, like the " Proprietor," is certainly insane a little, or grossly ignorant of the *fact.* I have brought proof. I think the *fact* amounts to a breach of the treaty, by which we acquired possession of the city of Buenos Ayres,

such is my construction of the law of nations. If Great Britain binds itself by a solemn engagement to preserve the religion of a city or district, she violates that engagement if she sends the professor of another religion *as a Missionary* amongst them, without they express a wish to have such a man amongst them. Statesmen and civilians must determine whether my opinion is correct or not. I am a decided friend to liberty of conscience, and that every Christian of every denomination should enjoy every civil right in its utmost extent. But it is going too far indeed to permit Sectarians, or members of our Church, to assume those rights and duties which belong only to the executive government. In this instance, these Missionary Directors did assume that power which for general safety, should belong to the executive government only.

From the gentleman's reasoning as to Buenos Ayres, the reader may form some notion of his abilities. Such he says is the winding-up of all my assertions. He speaks truth, and he could not pay me a greater compliment. With respect to the English Missionaries, and Drs. Buchanan and Kerr, I state the

facts fairly. I reason upon them, precisely as I did, relative to the Buenos Ayres' Missionary, according to the best of my judgment; it is left to others to judge whether I reason rationally or irrationally.

This gentleman says, that I wish " to arrest the progress of Christianity in India." A silly and a groundless charge. I wish to preserve India to Great Britain. I wish not in the first instance, to make that country a scene of blood. But do I set my judgment up as infallible? Let my propositions be fairly considered, and let not, as hitherto has been the case, abuse be substituted for argument.

What can exceed the folly of this gentleman in putting me down as an advocate for Catholics? I have said that Catholic Missionaries, have been just as unsuccessful in making converts, as Sectarian Missionaries. I said that both were men pure in their morals, and inoffensive in their characters, and could do no mischief if neither countenanced, nor discouraged by the British government.

Does this gentlemen conceive that I would not have retracted my opinion as to Catholic

Missionaries, had I discovered that *they* had acted with the same unexampled and mischievous imprudence, as the Sectarian Missionaries? The gentleman will find by perusing my letter to the Reverend Mr. Owen, a complete refutation of the charge of inconsistency, which he has preferred against me.

The gentleman speaks of a narrow slip of territory on the southern part of the coasts of Malabar and Coromandel, in which I well know there are a number of Christians. These with the Syrian Christians of Mayala, and the Portugueze, he estimates at seven hundred thousand, I should have thought they were a million, as the Portugueze are very numerous in India. But it is idle and absurd to mention these Christians at all. I wrote upon the different plans for Christianizing the immense population of India. Fifty millions of Hindoos and Mahomedans. The gentleman says, the converts have been *numerous*. Where are they? Who are they? I can find no account of them in the Missionary Reports. I am assured by gentlemen, very lately returned from India, that conversions are not more frequent *now* than they were when I was in India, twenty-six years ago. It is incumbent upon this gentleman,

and those who, like him, have been seized with a missionary mania, to prove that I have been misinformed. With all the pretension that this gentleman makes to knowledge, he did not know that there was a British *and* Foreign Bible Society. He supposed there was a British Bible Society, and a Foreign Bible Society—not knowing. as it is evident, that there is a Bible Society established in 1780, for distributing Bibles in the Army and Navy.

There is a British and Foreign Bible Society established in 1804, of which Lord Teignmouth is the president. Equally ignorant was this gentleman that a Protestant Missionary was sent to Buenos Ayres by the Missionary Society.

I have not given the slightest cause, by any thing I have either said or written for any man to conclude me inveterate or hostile to the British and Foreign Bible Society, or that I have been actuated by malice, hatred, or revenge, in what I have written as to the Missionaries. These accusations so profusely scattered through the gentleman's letter, must appear highly ridiculous indeed to all who personally know me.

I have had the honour to be acquainted with the Noble President of the Bible Society for nearly thirty-seven years. No circumstance in his progress through life, could induce me for one moment to question his honour, his integrity, or his merit as a public and as a private man. Others of that society I also know, and very highly esteem. But so convinced am I of the candour of Lord Teignmouth, that if he condescended to be a pamphleteer, I would ask him if I was not justified in believing that the English Missionaries were the agents of the Society. Two thousand pounds were transmitted to the Missionaries, in aid of the translation of our Holy Scriptures. The New Testament was translated in 1806, and in three months of that year, one edition was gratuitously distributed together with twenty thousand religious tracts. The Reverend Mr. Owen has set me right. He says, that the plan of the Bible Society is, he presumes, to give our Holy Scriptures as a dole of charity to petitioners. A plan to which no possible objection can be made by a Christian, and I assure the gentleman I am one, though he *suspects* I "have no religion at all."

I will beg leave to insert another proof of this gentleman's *moderation:*

"Your rancour is never to be satisfied, although you sacrifice to its craving, every thing that is dear in *individual consideration;* every thing that is valuable *in general estimation.*

"Your passion raging instead of diminishing by the continued violence of its exertions rises higher and higher. I pray you to watch over it, lest it should prove fatal to yourself. You who have been in India, must have seen the Scorpion destroy itself by its own venom. I make you a present of the fact, you will know how to apply it."

"And is it for you to talk of counteracting the benevolent designs of the Almighty, or of the perversion of a passage in the Gospel which inculcates the doctrine of peace and good will among all men? You who insult the essence of the Divinity, by endeavouring to destroy the harmony of his Creatures, and to prevent the fulfilment of his commands?" "Oh fie! Oh fie!"

If the Barrister publishes a second edition of his Hints on Evangelical Preaching, he may bring the preceding passage as another proof of the dexterity with which those bred up in the school

of Calvin can get over a difficulty. If the gentleman who penned it was *indeed* twenty years in India, the Evangelical Clergy, and the Missionaries have wrought wonderful change in him. I have as general an acquaintance, amongst gentleman who have been in every part of India as most people, but I know not one capable of penning such a paragraph. The gentleman begins by gross, and inapplicable abuse. Does he end by disputing my assertion, that Mr. Ward a Baptist Missionary, had impiously perverted a passage on the Holy Gospel? Oh no. That would have been coming *to an issue*. The end is, that it is *not for me* to talk of the benevolent designs of the Almighty, or of the perversion of a passage in that Gospel, which inculcates the doctrine of peace and good-will amongst all men.

It is the easiest way I ever knew of getting over *a difficulty*.

When this gentleman speaks of my sacrificing every thing that is dear to *individual consideration*, and every thing that is valuable *in general estimation*, in order to gratify my rancour, he speaks a language which I cannot clearly

comprehend. The charge of *rancour* is too false, and too contemptible to answer, except by a solemn declaration, that a man does not exist against whom I entertain *rancour*, or resentment. What does the gentleman mean *by individual consideration*. Amongst the very great number of gentlemen with whom I am in habits of intimacy, and from many of whom I have received acts of friendship and kindness, there may possibly be some whose sentiments on the subject of my preface do not exactly agree with mine. But surely this gentleman cannot mean to insinuate that by publicly declaring my honest and conscientious opinion on a point so closely connected as I think this is with the safety of India, I have lost the friendship of those who differ from me in opinion. I know their liberality too well to entertain a fear of this nature. Yet if the gentleman does not mean this, what is it he does mean?

With respect to *general estimation* I am most confident also, that no man who is a loyal subject to the King, and firmly attached to the constitution, will forfeit *general estimation* for giving his opinion as to the conduct of Sectarian Missionaries. Does the gentleman

know what the sentiments of the Arch-bishops and Bishops are upon this subject—of the Legislature—of the Court of Directors—of the King's Ministers—of the public at large—what then does he mean by *general estimation*? It can only be the estimation of the Evangelical Clergy, and who I hope and trust are not very numerous, and of the seceders from the good old Church of England.

If this is what he means by *general estimation,* the fact may be true, although I have Christian charity enough to hope and believe it is not. But what a melancholy consideration, if it should be true? The conductors of the Christian Observer do indeed entertain an opinion similar to that of this gentleman, they threaten the opposition, *to a man,* of that powerful party, if it shall appear that the Company is the grand bar to the introduction of the Gospel into India. Yet the members composing the Company are expressly called upon to exercise *their unbiassed judgment,* which will be of consequence indeed, if it should concur with the judgment of the powerful party alluded to by the conductors of the Christian Observer. But if it *does*

not, that party will *to a man,* oppose the Company in future.

Such is the gentleman's doctrine *as to* general *estimation*: his *world* is like that of Betty the house-maid, who observed that *all the world* knew she was going to leave her mistress on Friday.

What knowledge has the gentleman of any man's *general estimation?* Can he find it in the furious and implacable school of John Calvin? I hope and I firmly believe, that, I think on this subject with the orthodox members of the Church of England, and of Scotland also. The Church of Scotland has never sent a Missionary to India. The Church of England afforded a trifling pecuniary assistance to Danish Missionaries in former times. It has no connection with the twenty-three Sectarian Missionaries now in India. I hope and believe that the East India Company, the King's Ministers, and the Legislature will think as I do on this subject. That it has already been taken up by the Court of Directors, and that something has been done I believe, but that something *will* be done, I have not a doubt.

I can assure the gentleman upon my honour that the account which he has published of a deep-laid plan for a general revolt on the coast, prior to the mutiny at Vellore is perfectly new to me. By this gentleman's statement, dreadful as was the carnage at Vellore, we owe the preservation of India to that melancholy event. Since I read the gentleman's Letter I have seen two officers who were of rank on the coast, I asked them if in any of their letters, there was the least mention of any plan for a revolt, prior to the orders for a change in the dress of the Sepoys. They assured me they had not, and that every letter from the coast imputed the mutiny to these orders, and to the opinion instilled into the minds of the native troops by disaffected men, that our next step would be to compel them to embrace Christianity. Of the fact, that there was a deep-laid plan for a general revolt of the native troops, *prior* to the order for a change in the dress, every person on the coast appears to have been ignorant until after the mutiny, and to this moment as far as I know. From what the gentleman has said, I must presume that the discovery was made by the committee appointed by the Madras Government to enquire into the causes that led to the mutiny, and this gentleman

tells me, "After all I have a better opinion of *your intelligence,* and your understanding, than to imagine that I have stated any thing, *with which you are not well acquainted.*"

I can only, in answer to such insinuations, declare most solemnly, that I never saw the Report, and of its contents I never heard one syllable; all that I did know was this, that the Report of the Committee was received at the India House. I read a speech of Mr. Grant during the last session, in which he says, that other causes distinct from the orders for a change in the dress, were connected with the mutiny. These I supposed naturally to be, a complete revolution in the Government of the Carnatic, and Tippoo Sultaun's dominions, which reduced so many families from affluence to poverty, and from consequence, to insignificance, and produced discontent, and disaffection.

But in consequence of the *insinuations* of this gentleman as to my *intelligence,* I deem it necessary to declare solemnly that I wrote the Pamphlet and the Observations, the Letter to Mr. Owen, and I write this Reply to the gentleman, to use the words of the Reverend Mr. Owen, without communication with any per-

son whatsoever; and desire to be considered as alone responsible for every thing I have advanced.

The gentleman goes on, "at least you are convinced that the Missionaries, and the translation of the Scriptures, were not either directly, or indirectly connected with it."

The gentleman must have read what I have written, that the Missionaries had no concern directly or indirectly with the mutiny. But if he has really been twenty years in India, it is wonderful he never should have heard, that those who instilled into the minds of the native troops, the false and absurd opinion that we meant to compel them to embrace Christianity, attempted to prove the truth of their assertion, by referring to the change in the dress, the increase and activity of Missionaries, the institution of schools and the gratuitous circulation of parts of our Holy Scriptures.

I do know that a native officer, complained to his colonel, that one of *the Padres*, as he called a Missionary, was continually teasing him to become a Christian, and he begged the colonel to interfere.

If the Court of Directors, his Majesty's Ministers, or the Legislature have any *doubts*, as to the folly, and the absurdity of Evangelical Clergymen and Missionaries of late years in India, or of the *danger* to be apprehended from them, if some orders are not already, or shall not soon be sent out, the fullest evidence I am most confident can be given by gentlemen who are not hostile to religion and its interests. Indeed it is a detestable calumny upon a community to make a general assertion as Doctor Kerr did at Madras.

The gentleman has drawn a most frightful and alarming picture indeed of the consequences that have resulted from the late wars, and the late changes in India. I have carefully abstained from giving any opinion as to the justice of the Maratta war, the wisdom of the subsidiary treaties, or the assumption of the sovereignty of the Carnatic, and a commutation of territory in lieu of military subsidies from the Nabob of Oude, and the Nazim of the Decan. But the gentleman must know that Tippoo Sultaun, a Mussulman, was one of the most cruel, unfeeling, and merciless tyrants that ever sat upon a throne. He was also a religious bigot, and most wantonly oppressed four-fifths of his subjects who were

Hindoos. With more of the milk of human kindness in his composition, the Nabob of the Carnatic did, I firmly believe, oppress his subjects to the extent stated by the Earl of Buckinghamshire, and it is impossible to picture a more tyrannical, or a more ruinous government for the people, than that of the Carnatic. In Oude, there was neither police nor law; and those parts of that Nabob's dominions which are ceded to us were his most exposed frontiers, where his authority was little more than nominal. To the million therefore, I say, that the change from a native government to an English government, has been a blessing. But I am well aware as I have stated, that many of the principal persons in the Carnatic, Mysore, &c. who did possess consequence, were reduced to insignificance and poverty by the changes; and I must repeat that very thing ought to have been avoided which by possibility might increase disaffection.

This gentleman says, " You have a facility in receiving new impressions from recent information, or very high authority, and as you have no very particular reason to dispute mine, take my assurances for once, and believe this truth, that if we hear and redress the grievances of our native subjects; if we suppress *that rapacity*

and *petty tyranny* which have been too frequently and too fatally exercised amongst them; if we conciliate their minds, which may be easily effected by those little civilities and attentions which they are entitled to, and which common courtesy demands; and if in short, we rule them with justice, leaning towards mercy and lenity; there will not be any ground of apprehension for the permanency of our Asiatic government. It will be fixed upon a rock not to be shaken by all the powers of the world. The Bible Society may then perform their duty to God, themselves, and their fellow creatures, and translate and circulate the Holy Scriptures *throughout Hindostan*, without the dread of giving offence, or the fear of receiving insult!"

This is the most important, indeed, I may say, it is the *only* important passage in the Letter that the gentleman has sent to me. Although he has expressed *his suspicions*, that *I have no religion at all*—although he has said that my *resentments* are *never* to be gratified, nor *my rancour* to be satisfied, yet if he has *really* been twenty years in India, I shall be very happy if he will favour me with a morning's conversation, that we may coolly and rationally discuss this subject. I do assure him that if he can convince me I am in an

error, I will acknowledge it. For the present I will proceed to shew why it is I conscientiously believe I am right.

The new impression which I received from *recent information* was simply this: every letter that I had seen from Madras, when the first accounts arrived implicated Tippoo's sons in the mutiny at Vellore. But before I wrote the Preface, I had seen a letter from Lieutenant Colonel Marriot, who was with them in the palace at Vellore, at the time of the mutiny, expressing his conviction of their innocence. The opinion of Lieutenant Colonel Marriot is inserted in the historical part of the Annual Register of 1806; and therefore I have no hesitation in quoting the authority, which induced me to say, in the Preface, that I had reason to believe they were innocent, "From very high authority." I received *no new impression.* That authority was a respectable prelate of the Church of England, who had erroneously supposed, that either in India, or here, an opinion prevailed that the Missionaries had some concern in the mutiny at Vellore.

Will this gentleman tell me why upon his authority, I should receive *as a truth,* an opinion which I will take upon me to say is, in contradiction to the opinion of at least ninety-nine

out of a hundred who have been or are now in the civil or military service of the Company in India. If this gentleman will honour me with a visit, or if he will give me his address I will wait upon him, and I do assure him I will pay the most impartial attention to any arguments he may urge in support of the very extraordinary opinion that he has given; but unless he does this, I cannot believe that he has been an hour in India.

All that he says we ought to do, to conciliate the natives, has I am sure been invariably done in Bengal, where our government is considered a *blessing*, and the people bend submissively *to our mild sway*. Such were the sentiments of Dr. Buchanan in 1805. Lord Teignmouth's opinion in 1782, though not expressed in language so strong, was in substance the same. Yet if the gentleman has attended to India discussions, he must know, that for *ten years*, we heard as much nonsense as to the oppression of the Bengal Government, and the misery of the natives, as we may now read in the Missionary Reports, relative to the success of the Missionaries, in making numerous converts to Christianity.

I have no reason to believe that the same

system which has so long been established in Bengal, does not prevail on the coast. Magistrates are appointed for the administration of justice to Mahomedans and Hindoos according to the laws of the Koran and the Shastah. Collectors for receiving the public revenues, the amount of which are *fixed*, so that the collector cannot possibly act arbitrarily and oppressively. To what *rapacity*, to what *petty tyranny*, can the natives now be subject under the Madras Government? The attention of the civil and military servants of Bengal to the religion, manners, and customs of the natives, and their observance of ceremonial civilities, in all their intercourse with them, is a fact of general notoriety. When I speak of Bengal, the gentleman will of course understand, that I mean to include the rich and extensive dominions under the Bengal Government, containing at least, thirty millions of inhabitants, Hindoos and Mahomedans. I can well conceive, that for the first two years after we acquired the sovereignty of the Carnatic and of Tippoo Sultaun's dominions, the Madras civil servants had much to learn, but six years have elapsed since we have been sovereigns on the Coast. The junior servants have been wisely educated in the College of Fort William, and instead of the folly of teaching the natives to speak Eng-

glish, I hope the Bengal plan is fashionable on the coast, and that every English gentleman is anxious to be master of the languages of the country.

I will assume therefore, that on the Coast as in Bengal, the natives are not oppressed by *rapacity*, or by *petty tyranny*, that they are treated as in Bengal with civility and attention, that they are ruled with justice, leaning towards mercy and lenity. I am then to take *the* following *truth*, on the credit of a gentleman, who says he has been upwards of twenty years in India. " The Bible Society and the English Missionaries may then perform their duty to God, themselves, and to their fellow creatures, and translate and circulate the Holy Scriptures, *without the dread of giving offence or receiving insult.*

The gentleman has not *defined* the length to which English Missionaries may go, nor the mode in which the Scriptures may be circulated without the dread of giving offence or receiving insult.

Does he mean that the English Missionaries, who have already given great offence, and who have already been grossly insulted, may con-

tinue to act as they have hitherto done, without risquing the existence of our empire in India? Have I not *proved* from the evidence of these Missionaries, that they have been reviled and insulted, that our Holy Gospel has been abused, and that they cannot, as they assure us, enter a bigotted city without creating universal alarm? In addition to the instances that I have stated, take the following account from Mr. Marshman, one of the nine English Missionaries in Bengal. He was at Saugor, during a great Hindoo festival, where at least two hundred thousand Hindoos were assembled. He preached to as many as could hear him, and he told the Hindoos, "*that he* did not come like other Englishmen *to take their money*, but to bring the Jewel, above all price, the grand offer of Salvation." The Hindoos became clamorous, on their devotions being thus disturbed, and Mr. Marshman exclaimed, "Well, since you decline it, remember that *as you have received the Gospel*, you have no longer any excuse for idolatry, *but will be damned everlastingly*." Really if the gentleman can defend these mad Calvinists, I shall think he is *as insane* as they are.

Does the gentleman mean that the Scriptures, and that religious tracts may be *gratuitously*

circulated *throughout Hindostan,* without the dread of giving offence, or receiving insult? If he does I cannot think his opinion *as a truth* to be relied on.

I will tell him what my opinion is. The Holy Scriptures *may be translated,* and liberally distributed on that plan which the Reverend Mr. Owen says, *is the plan* of the British and Foreign Bible Society. To *petitioners,* and to those who may ask what they shall do to be saved.

But if they are *gratuitously* distributed, as one edition of the New Testament was distributed, and twenty thousand religious tracts, in three months only of the year 1806, abusing the religion of the country, then I say, if the distribution is made *" throughout Hindostan,"* the destruction of the British empire in India *is inevitable.*

That Missionaries may be as numerous as the funds of the Society can make them, and as zealous also, I now think as I thought in July, without any danger to the state, but the gentleman will take the context also, supposing them to be men inoffensive in their characters. Such were the Missionaries *of*

former days, and such I supposed were the Missionaries *of the present day,* until I read the Reports of the "Baptist" and "Missionary Society." Could it have entered into the imagination of man, that some thousands of a religious tract, should have been given away amongst the native troops, and the natives of Bengal, beginning, Hear all ye people, and proceeding to abuse the religion of the country? Does the gentleman think that if I had known of this Paper in July, or that the English Missionaries in India were mad Calvinists, I would have said that Missionaries, however numerous, could do no mischief in India?

The gentleman, if he meant his letter for any other use than to delude his Methodist friends, should have defined accurately *the extent* to which the Bible Society and the Missionaries might go without giving offence or receiving insult. As it now stands, there is nothing that these *new orders in the state* may not do, provided the British Government refrains from acts of repacity and tyranny, and treats the natives with kindness and civility. A more dangerous, a more unfounded opinion never was given, and yet this anonymous writer tells me that I have no very particular reason to

distrust his assurances, and therefore desires me to receive *as a truth* an opinion which I am sure the Court of Directors, the King's Ministers and the Legislature, will not attend to for an instant. Let the Scriptures be circulated amongst petitioners, and amongst those who may *ask* what they can do to be *saved*, and then there will be no danger of offence to the natives, or insult to us. But who can restrain nine mad Calvinists? Could wiser, could more conciliating instructions, have been issued by any Society, than were issued by the Baptist Society to their Missionaries in Bengal? In what instance have these orders been obeyed? Let the gentleman go through the series of the Baptist Reports, and he will cease to wonder why these men cannot as they tell us enter a bigotted city without creating an universal alarm. The state of my health prevents me from mixing much in society during the winter months, but I can assure the gentleman that I have never met *one person* who has been in Bengal, Madras, or Bombay, that does not entirely concur with me in opinion, as to the danger to be apprehended, if mad Calvinistic Missionaries are not to be removed.

If there was that deep-laid plan for a general revolt of the native troops, which the gentleman has detailed, it adds very considerably indeed to the force of my argument. If the population of an empire is disaffected, it is madness to interfere with their religion. The orders for the change of the dress have been noticed by the gentleman in terms much stronger than those which I used.

This gentleman not contented with leaving the Missionaries to evangelize the Heathen, has found out another employment for them. "If you should ask me why even the number (of Missionaries) I have mentioned be allowed, I will tell you, that for the last twenty years there has always been at least four, sometimes more, and that since the vast extension of our territories, twenty are not sufficient, unless it be intended that our European soldiers, in the different forts and stations throughout Hindostan, *should be abandoned by the clergy,* and never hear the Gospel preached, nor the Scriptures expounded to them." The gentleman then goes on to state that there are many small garrisons in which there are ten or twelve Europeans, that the Missionaries "would chearfully visit them alternately," to

cultivate the morals of those Europeans, and so make them good men, which I am told is the best way to make them good soldiers."

Does the gentleman suppose that the Court of Directors would be capable of thus degrading and disgracing the Church of England? Who are these Missionaries? They are not members of the Church of England, they are not clergymen. They are Calvinistic Methodists on the Coast, and Baptists in Bengal. Double, treble, the number of the regular clergy should it be necessary, but do not compel any man to listen to the extempore prayers and sermons of a Calvinistic Methodist. If still there should be a military station or a garrison without a clergyman, why not appoint an officer to officiate as chaplain *pro tempore*. He can read divine service from our excellent liturgy, and the lessons from the Bible, he can read one of the many admirable sermons composed by divines of the Church of England. I was two years chaplain to an English regiment in India, when there was no clergyman attached to the army, and only two in Calcutta, and I think I made a much better Clergyman than any lay Calvinistic Methodist or Baptist in India,

could have made, for Protestants *of the Church of England.* I can appeal to one of my congregation who is in England, the Dowager Lady Lyttleton, to prove that we did not want a Sectarian layman to instruct us in our duty.

I can assure the gentleman that I am as little of a bigot as he is. I do not think that any subject of the empire should be deprived of any civil right, on account of his religious opinions. But as the gentlemen in the civil and military service of the Company are with very few exceptions indeed, Protestants *of the Church of England,* they should have the benefit of the instruction which a Clergyman *of that Church* can give them, where it is possible to give it to them, where it is not, an officer as in former times, ought to be appointed to perform divine service, to marry, to christen, and to inter the dead.

Yet where no clergyman can be had, these necessary duties are to be performed, if the gentleman's advice is followed, by Calvinistic Methodists, and Baptists, who are laymen. If there are any gentlemen in India who have a fancy for Methodists and Baptists, they may have opportunities enough of indulging their taste, if

these men are to remain in India, but surely the Court of Directors will never insult and degrade the Church of England, by authorising Sectarians to perform the duty of the Church in India, which after all they would not do, for they pray, and preach extempore.

I had observed that on the continent of Africa the chiefs possessing authority had the *option* to receive Missionaries or not, and to dismiss them at their pleasure. In British India there was not this *option*.

His answer is most curious indeed. The princes of India *have the same option,* he says. So gross a deception was never attempted. Great Britain is the *absolute sovereign* of an empire containing fifty millions of people, who are our native subjects at this moment. What man has *an option* in that extensive empire? Where is the Rajah or the Zemindar who has any option at all, and it was of the empire under our dominion that I spoke? The Marattas it is true are independent—so is the Rajah of Travancore—the Mussulman Nazim of the Decan, and the Mussulman Nabob of Oude. But how does Dr. Buchanan state the fact in his Memoir? He estimates the population of

Hindostan, at one hundred millions. The half of this number, he says, *are native subjects of Great Britain,* and over the sovereigns of the other half, he says, we have an influence. He proposes that we should attempt to destroy institutions established in India for ages, because we have about thirty thousand British subjects in India. If the Legislature and the Church adopt so wild a plan, as an obedient subject, I should lament, and be silent. But hitherto, thank God, no law has passed to prevent me from giving my opinion, as to the folly of Doctors Buchanan and Kerr, and the English Missionaries in India. They are indeed, according to my conception, real disciples of the school of Voltaire.

I will give another specimen of the gentleman's reasoning, which will prove, I think, that if he has really been twenty years in India, he acquired no useful knowledge there.

Because the natives have abused and reviled the Missionaries, have mocked the rites of baptism, have tied up one of the miserable paupers called converts, and fed him with cow-dung, and have even had the indecency to abuse our Holy Gospel, an act

hitherto unheard of. "*Is the idea* (the gentleman says) *to be suffered,* that *they can be alarmed* at seeing these Missionaries in the country?" This reasoning may convince his Methodist associates perhaps, but what must rationnal men think of it, an idea "not to be suffered!!!" Sed non meus est hic sermo.—I take it from the Missionaries themselves. *They* tell us that not one of them can enter a bigotted city without creating *universal alarm.* It is indeed a most extraordinary instance of intrepidity, which the gentleman has displayed. With the very expressions *before his eyes,* that these men have created alarm, he passes it by *without any notice whatever,* and tells me the idea that they have created an alarm, *is not to be suffered.*

Can a man who has been twenty years in India, be at a moment's loss to account for the violent conduct of the Hindoos. He must know that they are by their religion a tolerant people, and that the most contemptible character upon earth in their opinion, is the man who forsakes the religion of his ancestors. What must have been the conduct of the Missionaries, that could exhaust the patience of Hindoos? We know from themselves what their conduct has been: just

what the conduct of the followers of the unrelenting, furious John Calvin ever has been, and ever will be—They circulated pamphlets by thousands, vilifying the religion of the country. From Mr. Marshman we may learn of what *materials* their sermons were composed. It is a proof of the patience of Hindoos, that they were satisfied, by venting their resentment in words.

I know Mr. John Sulivan intimately, and I have known him these twenty years. I have the highest opinion of his abilities, and of his value as a Company's servant, when resident at Tanjore during the war with Hyder Ally Cawn. But as I am no adept in the school of Voltaire, and as I retain opinions early formed both as to religion and India politics; and perhaps from an idea proceeding from partiality, of the very great superiority of the Bengal, over the Madras Establishment, in every thing that relates *to Government*, I think the plan of schools for teaching the English language to natives, was a very mischievous plan.

But until I am better informed, I cannot conceive that Mr. John Sulivan entertained the wild and impracticable idea of converting

the immense population of Hindostan to Christianity, either through the medium of Free Schools, or of Missionaries.

In Calcutta there are few natives who speak English. But at the distance of fifty miles, a gentleman cannot get a glass of claret at dinner, or hot water for his tea unless he can call for it in the language of the natives. I have heard very sensible men from the Coast lament it as a great public misfortune, that so many of the natives spoke English, and that the English gentlemen were not versed, as they are in Bengal, in the languages of the country. The reason is obvious: we had no territorial possessions formerly on the coast, except the Northern Circars, and the Jaghire lands, and the latter were farmed to the Nabob. The great superiority of the Bengal to the Madras and Bombay civil servants, I do not impute to any superiority of talent in the former, but to the India education being so very different. Lord Wellesley's plan for bringing the junior servants of Madras and Bombay to the college of Fort William was a most excellent one, and I dare say by this time, they all know the native languages correctly.

The gentleman is mistaken in saying, that Mr. Wilberforce's clauses for Free Schools and Missionaries passed the Commons. They were *received* in one stage of the bill and withdrawn in another stage of it.

If the gentleman knows any thing of the political transactions of 1793 he must know, that had the clauses not been withdrawn, the East India Company was prepared to petition against them.

The gentleman says that my name has been long forgotten in India. He is right, as far as he goes. I was not a civil servant or a collector, a magistrate, or a resident at any foreign court, and the generation has passed away of those natives in the army to whom alone I could at any time be known. But if this gentleman means that I have not kept up a constant correspondence with my countrymen in India, as well as having a very extensive acquaintance amongst gentleman returned from every part of India, he is indeed very much mistaken.

The quibbling of this gentleman is endless.

From what has passed, I say that the na-

tives can form no other conclusion than this that if we cannot persuade, we shall compel them to embrace Christianity. I instance amongst those proceedings, the gratuitous distribution of one edition of the New Testament, and of twenty thousand religious tracts in three months only. The answer as to the translation of the Scriptures is this, " There certainly is *another*, and more *plausible reason* adapted to the conception of the natives of India, and that is, as they do not speak a word of English themselves, and as every Englishman on his own arrival in India, is obliged to make himself master of the language spoken in it, so as to speak it with fluency and correctness in twelve months, they would *naturally* conclude that the Scriptures were translated into those various languages to assist *him in studying them.* Am I right? You will at least admit my conclusion *to be possible,* and that is all I contend for in opposition to your assertion."

That this gentleman has been twenty years in India, I cannot believe, unless he will give me *his name.* I have no conception that any man who has been twenty years in India would condescend to reason like an ideot, on so plain a

subject. Could the natives *doubt a moment* as to the purpose for which the Scriptures were translated, when one complete edition of the New Testament, and twenty thousand religious tracts were gratuitously circulated amongst them in three months?

The gentleman says that the term *Evangelical* Clergyman is *unintelligible* to him. This indeed is wonderful. It was not invented when I went to India in 1766, Mr. Romaine and three or four of our clergy who agreed in opinion with him, were then called Methodists, but when I returned in 1781, they were sometimes called Evangelical Clergyman, sometimes Gospel preachers. I have always understood that the terms Evangelical Clergyman and Gospel preacher were invented by the Methodists, in order to stigmatize the great body of our clergy, whom they mention as sometimes delivering good moral discourses though they do not preach the Gospel. This cant is so very common, that I wonder it should be unintelligible to the gentleman. If he will look into the Report of the "Missionary Society," commonly called the London Missionary Society, he will find that the distinction is unhappily known *in India* as well as in Eng-

land. That Society speaking of a man, whom they call Brother Russell who was at Madras, say in page 23, "On several occasions he was solaced with the conversation and assistance *of some Evangelical Clergymen*, one resident in India, and others *newly arrived from England.*" I hope he does not conceive that any Clergyman of the good old Church of England, to which I belong, invented this odious, bigotted, and dangerous distinction.

The gentleman says that the collector and magistrate by *driving two Clergymen* out of Dacca, were well-disposed to listen to any complaints against Missionaries, and their plan of conversion. Are Mr. Carey and Mr. Moore *Clergymen?* The conduct of the collector and the magistrate was *firm* but lenient. They asked these men if they were aware of the consequence of coming to Dacca, *without a passport?*—that is of the breach of a positive regulation of Government. Will this gentleman tell me what they would have done to a free merchant or a trader, who had thus acted in defiance of law? I think they would have sent him under a guard to Calcutta, agreeably to the *orders* which I *know* are given to al lcollectors and magistrates by Government.

These men were prohibited from distributing any of their pamphlets, and told that those they had distributed the preceding evening, had caused considerable uneasiness amongst the people. On which the Missionary Moore who relates these facts observes, " that is amongst the Bramins." If the gentleman has really been twenty years in India, I wish to ask him, how we can govern India, if men who display such a contempt for legal authority, are not to be removed from Bengal?

Suppose a free merchant or a common trader had gone to Dacca, with boats laden with European articles, the Collector and the Magistrate in obedience to their orders must have sent him to Calcutta, under a guard; but these Missionaries who might have occasioned an insurrection in a populous province were merely prohibited from a further distribution of their religious tracts. The " Proprietor" gravely observes, that St. Paul " the great Missionary was frequently opposed by collectors as well as magistrates." The monstrous absurdity as well as the impiety of the observation is astonishing. To compare St. Paul, or even to couple his name in any way with India Missionaries as the gentleman says to me, " is

not to be endured." Who doubts the authority under which St. Paul acted, in defiance of collectors and magistrates? But shall these Missionaries appointed by a society of Sectarian individuals in England, be justified for shewing their contempt of orders and of law in any part of the British Empire, because St. Paul under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and at the express command of the Almighty, boldly preached the Gospel of Christ, at the hourly hazard of his life? Can India be preserved if they are not to be restrained?

He has most grossly calumniated the collector and the magistrate of Dacca, by saying they seemed *well disposed, by driving two clergymen out of Dacca* to listen to any complaint against them. This is indeed the kind of evangelical impartiality shewn to me.—Brother Carey and Brother Moore, two clergymen ! ! ! The gentleman if he knows any thing of India, must know, that in favor of these men, the collector and the magistrate broke the orders of Government; if they had obeyed them they must have sent them to Calcutta under a guard. It is not true either that they drove them out

of Dacca. The men had been mad enough the preceding evening to distribute in the environs of the city of Dacca four thousand abusive papers, which they call *religious pamphlets;* this outrageous act had caused considerable uneasiness amongst the people, and the magistrate and collector merely prohibited them from making any more disturbance. They did *not drive the Missionaries* out of Dacca. The men tell us, that finding they could do no good there they went away. The man who can defend the conduct of Mr. Carey and Mr. Moore, must indeed be a wild enthusiast. Whether they ought to be recalled in consequence of this contumacious act, may be a question of discussion, but I am sure no director or no statesman will attempt to defend the act.

This gentleman, from his zeal in defence of Dr Kerr, says, I have contradicted myself, by giving two very different accounts of the Portugueze in India,—that I describe them in one place as a considerable nation as to riches and numbers, and in another as the most contemptible of all people on the globe, not absolutely in a savage state. My description is correct and true. What wretched nonsense

does the gentleman produce in order to disprove it—That in their churches we find pomp and show, saints and images; an immense establishment of archbishops and bishops, and other dignitaries; that they possess the city of Goa, and its dependencies, which, by the bye, *we garrison;* that there are three very fine churches at each of our Presidencies where we have but one; and that there are many very rich Portugueze merchants, and men of considerable fortune in India of that nation. Do I dispute any one of these assertions? But do fine churches, or men with the titles of archbishops and bishops, of nominal sees, without either revenue or consequence, contribute to exalt the character of the Portugueze in India? Their merchants have acquired fortunes *in our settlements*. Have they *political power?* Have they a military or a naval force in India that is not contemptible, even in the opinion of the natives? Yet the Portugueze were once a great and powerful nation in India, and famed for their military exploits. I say again, that nothing can be more ridiculous than the fears expressed by Doctor Kerr, of the efforts of bare-footed Romanists in India, and the Portugueze, numerous as they are, and fine as their churches are, and large as is their ecclesiastical

establishment, *are*, taken *collectively*, the most contemptible people on the globe, not absolutely in a savage state.

The gentleman says, I have attacked Dr. Buchanan in a very unhandsome manner. How, I ask him. Dr. Buchanan published a Memoir in England, and dedicated it to the late Archbishop of Canterbury. Surely it was open to every gentleman to declare his sentiments on the plan contained in that Memoir. I gave my sentiments of it fully and fairly. I said what I still think, that he is a man of profound erudition, and great piety. But if his plan had been adopted, I am convinced that we could not have preserved the British Empire in India, for a year. The gentleman says Dr. Buchanan has *his errors*. This is far beyond whatever I said. I said in substance, that his *politics* were absurd. This is matter of *opinion*, and many may think that his politics are the perfection of human wisdom.

To propose a large ecclesiastical establishment for India; the institution of free schools throughout the country; the public appointment of Missionaries; to recommend the coercion of the contemptuous spirit of our

Mahomedan subjects, to say that the destitute children of Hindoos, and Mahomedans might be educated in the Christian Religion if the British Parliament pleased—and to propose as a thesis for public disputation in the college of Fort William, in which there were Hindoos and Mahomedan professors, the superiority of the Christian Religion to that of Mahomed or the Shastah, convinced me that Doctor Buchanan was as wild as the Baptist Missionaries themselves. Does he not tell us what his *object* is—the conversion to Christianity of fifty millions of people under our government, and of fifty millions, the subjects of native princes, over whom the British government has an influence. Who disputes the eligibility of the plan, were it *possible* that it could produce success? Who but an enthusiast in this subject, can believe it would have *one year's* trial, without its destroying the British empire in India, When I say who but an enthusiast, I mean amongst those who know any thing of India.

But in his dedication of the Memoir to the late Archbishop of Canterbury, Doctor Buchanan quotes an opinion of the Bishop of London, "that an ecclesiastical establishment in India is indispensibly necessary;" possibly the bishop

when he gave that opinion to Doctor Buchanan, meant that it was necessary for the inhabitants of the British settlements in India, the Christian inhabitants ; but for the purpose stated by Dr. Buchanan, it would be as useless as *Don Quixotte's* assault on the windmills. Will this gentleman tell me upon what principle it is, that Doctor Buchanan's Memoir should not be examined with the utmost freedom ? Have I treated the Doctor as *seven Evangelical* or Methodist writers have treated me ? I have not wandered from the subject to attack the religious or the moral character of Doctor Buchanan.

He proposes a most important public measure. He declares that if it is adopted the conversion of one hundred millions of Hindoos and Mahomedans, is *very practicable*. He dedicates it to the metropolitan, and he quotes the authority of the Bishop of London, in support of the measure which he recommends. In what terms can I write, who conceive the measure to be tantamount to fixing the period beyond which not an Englishman would be left alive in India.

The gentleman in his title page professes to

give "Strictures on my illiberal and unjust Conduct, towards the Missionaries in India." He has not *proved* that my conduct has been *illiberal* and *unjust* in a single instance. I have not brought one tittle of *evidence* forward respecting the Missionaries except *their own letters,* to their society at home. That these letters have attracted the serious attention of the Court of Directors, and his Majesty's India ministers I am most certain. The way the gentleman defends the Missionaries, is by passing over all the evidence, and he substitutes personal abuse and insinuation for argument.

This gentleman after speaking of the Missionaries having been *driven from Dacca,* says, "if you want further proofs of acts of severity on the part of the Bengal government, towards the Missionaries at the instant that it conferred upon them its plaudits for the meekness and extreme propriety of their conduct, you can find them in abundance narrated in a statement of the committee of the Baptist Society, by the secretary, printed this present year by J. Rutt, Shacklewell." I was certainly most anxious after reading the gentleman's letter, to see this statement. I had never heard of it before, and I applied for it at Mr. Burdit's in

Paternoster-row, where I found it was not a statement published for sale, but the bookseller gave me a copy of it. Most happy indeed am I to find that the good sense of the Bengal government, has induced the Governor General and Council to stop the wild career of these men. I can certainly find nothing said of the plaudits conferred upon them for the meekness and extreme propriety of their conduct, nor does the statement contain one syllable of Sir George Barlow's speech in favour of these Missionaries.

I desire that the gentleman will believe, "this truth," from me. Until he referred me to the statement of the Baptist committee, I knew not that the Bengal government had so effectually restrained the Missionaries and their native preachers from doing mischief in future. Had I known the circumstance earlier I should not have written one word about Bengal Missionaries I can also assure him that until within a short time, I knew not, that orders had been sent from England, for regulating the conduct of Missionaries in future.

There is indeed much of new, and very important information in the Baptist statement,

which I will beg leave to call the gentleman's attention to.

On the 24th of August, 1806, the following message was delivered to Mr. Carey, the head of the Baptist Mission, from the Governor General.

"That as Government did not interfere with the prejudices of the natives, it was his request, that Mr. Carey and his colleagues would not."

The request when explained amounted to this: "they were not to *preach to the natives, nor suffer the native converts to preach*; they were not *to distribute religious tracts*, nor suffer *their people to distribute them*; they were not to take any step by conversation or otherwise, for persuading the natives to Christianity."

Mr. Carey said that "neither *he*, nor his brethren wished to do any thing disagreeable to government, *from which they could conscientiously abstain.*"

At a subsequent conversation the preceding orders "were somewhat softened."

" It was not meant to prohibit Mr. Carey and his brethren, *from preaching at Serampore, or in their own house in Calcutta, but they must not preach in the Loll Bazar,* (the great market street in Calcutta.) " It was not intended to prevent them from circulating *the Scriptures,* but merely the tracts, *abusing the Hindoo religion.* There was no design to forbid the native Christians, *conversing* with their countrymen on Christianity, only *they must not go out under the sanction of the Missionaries.*"

The statement remarks that the conversation passed " at a time when the Vellore mutiny *greatly occupied men's minds,* but no hint was given that any efforts of the Missionaries had contributed to it, on the contrary the Magistrates said, they were well satisfied with their character and deportment, and that no complaint had ever been lodged against them."

The gentleman would indeed be justified in accusing the Bengal government of " *severity*" at the instant it conferred upon them *its plaudits* for the *meekness* and *extreme propriety* of their conduct, did not this very statement, *prove* that the Missionaries, were

actually at the time acting *in open rebellion* against the authority of the Bengal government.

If not only without *any cause,* but when the *positive merit* of the Missionaries was admitted, the Governor-General had issued his restrictive orders, I should not only have said with the gentleman, that the orders were *severe,* but I should have thought that a man of so arbitrary and so capricious a temper as the Governor General must have been, was unfit *for any office* in the service of the East India Company.

If the gentleman has been twenty years in India, I think I can prove to him, that the restrictive regulations of the Bengal government were wise and indispensably necessary, as they applied to native preaching, &c. &c.

In July or August 1806, one of the natives who having previously lost his Cast, was initiated into the rites of the Church, was employed by the Missionaries to preach to the people, at Cale Ghaut near Calcutta, where there is a Hindoo Temple, in which this preacher began to harangue the crowd,

condemning their idolatry, their worship and their sacrifices; expatiated on the superiority of the Christian doctrines, to which he was himself a convert, and exhorted them to follow his example, as the only means of salvation; affirming that the blind path they were pursuing, could only lead to destruction: the astonished Hindoos heard him with indignation; but for a while suppressed their feelings, supposing his reason to be deranged; but persisting in his animadversions, and becoming more vehement in exhortation, they at length lost all patience; and assaulting him with clods and brickbats, drove him from the temple, chased him into the street, and had not some of the police officers interfered, he would probably have suffered death from the hands of the enraged multitude. This affair became a common topic of conversation in Calcutta, and I have no doubt that as it occurred under the eye of the Governor General as I may say, it was one of the circumstances that induced him to prohibit native preaching *in future*. The gentleman will find the fact stated in a very well written pamphlet entitled "Vindication of the Hindoos," and if he has *really* been twenty years in India, I think the perusal of that pamphlet will afford him much pleasure.

Should he *doubt* the fact it can be fully proved.

I should suppose every gentleman who has served in India, and every gentleman in the United Kingdom who turns his attention to this important subject, will concur in opinion with me, that after such a circumstance had happened close to the seat of Government, it was high time to prohibit *native* preaching in future.

Another very extraordinary event, preceded the restrictive orders given to the English Missionaries.

On the 23d of August, 1806, *two English* Missionaries arrived in Calcutta, *in an American ship.* These men came to Bengal, in breach of the law of the land, and the number of English Missionaries was thus increased from *nine* to *eleven.* Government conceived it high time to interfere. They refused a clearance to the American captain unless he would engage to take these men, Brother Chater and Brother Robinson, back in his ship. In the mean time, the two brethren went to *Serampore,* and the Missionaries informed the Bengal Government, that *they*

had joined the Mission under their direction, and the protection of the King of Denmark." The affair became now very serious indeed, the Missionaries were in open rebellion. Government wrote to the Danish governor to know, "whether the Missionaries actually were under the protection of the Danish government," and were told in reply, that since they settled at Serampore, he, the governor, had represented their conduct in so favourable a light as being of service to the settlement, that the Court of Copenhagen had directed him to extend his protection to the Mission, and that in virtue of this high authority he had taken Messrs. Chater and Robinson *under the protection of his Danish Majesty*. After the answer arrived in Calcutta, the American Captain applied for his clearance, which was refused.

But at a subsequent conversation with the magistrates, the American captain said "that the Missionaries were willing, if fair and friendly representation could not prevail, rather than oppose Government, to give up the *two brethren;* and he added, *that though it might be a serious affair with America and Denmark* if he *and the Missionaries* were to be obstinate, yet they each considered the peace and

good understanding of nations to be a matter of such importance that they would give up almost any thing, rather than be the occasion of interrupting it." The American captain after this representation obtained his clearance, but Government was dissatisfied with the continuance of the two Missionaries at Serampore ; and to remove *every cause of complaint* as the Missionaries say, as far as they could, Mr. Chater and another brother agreed to go on a mission to the kingdom of Burmah.

The gentleman refers me to these most extraordinary transactions in order to prove the severity of the Bengal Government towards the "Missionaries." It is impossible he can have been twenty years in India. If he had, he must have known that the Bengal government treated the Missionaries with unexampled lenity. The two men who arrived first in Bengal in 1793, *broke the law*, by going there at all without the consent or knowledge of the Company. I firmly believe that not one of the Missionaries went to Bengal without a breach of the law of the land also. The two who arrived on the 23d of August 1806, it is evident came to Bengal in breach of the law. Government instantly determined that they should

not be allowed to remain in India. For the propriety of this determination they are accountable to the Company, his Majesty's India ministers, and the legislature. But before there was an opportunity of sending these men back in the ship that conveyed them to Bengal, they got to Serampore, and defied the government, by claiming the protection of the King of Denmark. Such is *Missionary gratitude.*

Most unfortunately indeed it happens that this nation and Denmark are involved in war, but it will enable the Bengal government to act according as their judgment may direct, towards these rebellious Missionaries, for by claiming as they did the protection of the Danish flag, to keep two men in Bengal contrary to the determination of the British Government, they rebelled against its authority.

What folly it is to speak of the "severity" of the Bengal government, or of the *meekness,* and extreme propriety of the conduct of the Missionaries, when the statement proves that these very men had at the time set at defiance the authority of Great Britain in India, by claiming the protection of a foreign state, and at the hazard too of involving the nation in a

very serious dispute with Denmark and the American government.

I will now examine the comments made by the English Missionaries, on the restrictive orders of the Bengal government.

" No political evil, can reasonably be feared, from the spread of Christianity now, for it has been publickly preached in Bengal for about twenty years past, without the smallest symptom of the kind."

But are the Baptist Missionaries, or their Society in England, persons authorised *by law* to determine whether or not a political evil is to be reasonably feared *from the spread of Christianity in India?* Even if that were the question, which it certainly is not, for the question is, whether the *new* methods adopted in the hope of spreading Christianity in India are dangerous?

No political evil was to be dreaded undoubtedly from the spread of Christianity in India, until Calvinist Missionaries arrived in India.

" Within the *last five years,* an edition of the New Testament, of two thousand copies,

one of Mathew (not as *we* always say *Saint* Matthew) of five hundred, one of the Psalms and Isaiah of a thousand, besides many copies of a second edition of the New Testament, and of the poetical books of scripture from Job to Canticles, and *many religious tracts,* have been distributed amongst the natives, *without a single instance of disturbance, unless the abusive language of a few loose persons may be so called.*"

Will the gentleman refer to the instances which I have published in the preface of the dissatisfaction these men have caused, *wherever they went?* Will he refer *to their own declaration,* that not one of them can enter a bigoted city, without creating *universal alarm,* and then let him say whether these men *are worthy of credit?* What they have last written is *false,* or what they wrote before *was* false.

"To this might be added the experience of the Missionaries on the Coast; who have taught Christianity for an hundred years, and reckon *about forty thousand persons* who have embraced it." This is another direct false assertion. Doctor Kerr admits on the 7th of November, 1806, that "hitherto it is generally imagined few good converts have been made."

"Thousands of Heathens, (they add,) are willing to hear the Gospel, *but we are forbidden to preach it.* Had it been an idolatrous power, we might have been prepared to endure whatever *sufferings* might have been inflicted upon us, but the idea of being forbidden *to spread Christianity by a Christian government confounds us.*"

The assertion is *false,* that they have been *forbidden to preach the Gospel.* They are allowed to preach it at *Serampore,* and at their house *in Calcutta,* but not in the Loll Bazar, the great market street in Calcutta. They are not now allowed to *itinerate* the country, nor gratuitously to circulate *their religious tracts.* Let the gentleman look to the extracts from the proceedings of these men, published in my Preface, and then let him determine if he has been twenty years in India, whether the Governor-General and Council would have done their duty, had they suffered them any longer to insult and irritate the natives, by their religious tracts, and their field-preaching. Thousands of Heathen, these men say, are willing to hear the Gospel. It is a false and a wicked assertion, in the way in which the Missionaries desire to be understood. Curiosity may draw,

as it has done, thousands together to hear these men preach, but they are not likely, to use the elegant expression of one of the Coast Missionaries, "to catch one (of the thousands) in the Gospel net."

"We have hitherto obeyed those who have been set over us, not from constraint, but with a willing mind, and must we now be reduced, and that *by a* British government, to the cruel alternative of disobeying *them, or God?* We will commit our cause to Him that judgeth righteously, trusting in him to incline our rulers to re-consider the matter, and grant us permission to fulfil the most indispensible of all duties, our duty to God; for wo unto us if we preach not the Gospel!"

The affected humility of this paragraph, is as curious as its daring insolence. The alternative left to these "faithful servants of the Lord, of whom the world is not worthy," is, that they must *violate the law or disobey God.* Wo unto them, if they do not preach the Gospel! Why not instantly then embark for the Cape of Good Hope, visit the interior of Africa, and preach the Gospel to savages. They have *hitherto* obeyed. Do they claim a

merit for this obedience? Must not every British subject obey those whom the law has placed in authority over him, or take the consequences that must result from his disobedience? Did these men display *a very submissive spirit*, when they sheltered Brother Chater, and Brother Robinson at Serampore *and gratefully accepted the protection of the Danish flag?*

In fact, they accuse the Bengal government of the sin of " crushing Christianity in India."

Then follows the most absurd nonsense that ever was penned, relative to the *political advantages*, that would result from the conversion of the natives; and they add, " these remarks are *abundantly proved*, by what is seen *in our native converts*. " We have baptised about a *hundred of them*, and we *dare affirm*, that the British Government, *has not a hundred better subjects*, and more cordial friends amongst the natives of Hindostan."

This is a most atrocious falsehood. Of their hundred converts, whom they have baptized in *thirteen years*, many they have dismissed for

gross immorality by their own accounts. In August 1806, the English Missionaries had been *thirteen years* in India. At what period their numbers had been increased from *two* to *nine* does not appear, but the average of their converts is *eight in a year*. Yet these men have preached in different villages. Two of them, Brother Carey and Brother Moore, broke the law by going to Dacca without a passport; they have preached at Dinagepore, Jessore, Cutwah, and Saugor; they have gratuitously distributed in three months of 1806, twenty thousand religious tracts, two thousand copies of the New Testament, and other parts of our Holy Scriptures, and what have they done towards converting the perishing millions of India to Christianity?—absolutely *nothing*.—I know what the converts to Christianity were when I was in India, the most worthless fellows in the whole community. I must believe gentlemen lately arrived from India, who assure me that the converts of the present day, are equally worthless, because those gentlemen can have no possible motive for misleading me, and none but a hot-headed Calvinist will suppose them to be hostile to Christianity, and its interests.

The assertion that they have *hitherto* obeyed the British Government is false. Mr. Carey and Mr. Thomas broke the law by the manner in which they got to India; Mr. Carey and Mr. Moore broke the law by going to Dacca in the autumn of 1805, without a passport; Mr. Ward and Mr. Chamberlaine disobeyed the Government by *itinerating* to Cutwa, and to Jessore *after* the Missionaries were prohibited from *itinerating* at all.

The Missionaries *collectively* when they placed Messrs. Chater and Robinson under the protection of the Danish flag, resisted the authority of the government, and in the most offensive manner possible.

The deceptions practised by these Missionaries, which they perhaps consider as pious and meritorious frauds are most shameful. A man whom Mr. Thomas puts down as a Bramin, a man of title, and of whose conversion he sent an account to his society, which none but a madman could have written, was in fact *a servant* of Mr. Thomas, an outcast from society. This fellow Parbotee as he is called,

robbed his master, Mr. Thomas, ran away, and as I understand died mad at a distant period.

Yet what a figure does this fellow cut in a sermon preached before a Missionary Society by the Reverend Basil Wood, an Evangelical Clergyman.

The Missionaries further say, " *God is* raising up converts *of talents* and *character.*

Where are they ?—Who are they ?—This is a fact well deserving of serious enquiry. If at the end of *thirteen years,* during which period these Missionaries have done *nothing,* men of *talents* and *character* have embraced Christianity, it would indeed be very important ; for if Christianity is to *spread* in India, it must be by the conversion of men of *talents* and *character,* not by *bought converts,* as the beggars are, nor by the pretended conversion of outcasts. *Prove* the fact, and I will acknowledge my error, but until it is proved I must believe that the assertion is false.

This is a point, on which the gentleman will

find me most cordially to agree with him. If *God* has raised up converts of *talents* and *character,* it is high time for a Christian nation to adopt the most proper mode for christianizing the population of Hindostan. I must however have some *proof* of the fact, before I can credit the assertion.

The principles of the Baptist Society, and of their Missionaries in Bengal, strike at the very root of all government, law, and order.

The Society as the Statement informs us, was instituted in 1792, without any particular view to India. But being afterwards informed " of the moral and religious state of the Hindoos, of their *willingness to listen to addresses on Christianity,* and that there was no Christian Missionary of any denomination in Bengal," they considered that kingdom as a proper object of attention, and resolved if possible to make their first essay in that quarter.

The fact was true that in 1792, there was no Christian Missionary in Bengal. Mr. Kiernander the Danish Missionary was dead, and his place had not been supplied by any

other person. The Romanists had abandoned so unproductive a soil.

The Church of England took no step for the conversion of the natives of India, and this Society hearing *of the willingness of the Hindoos to listen to addresses on Christianity*, determined to commence their attempts by a direct breach of the law of the land. From what quarter they received their information, I know not. But as the Hindoos hold it in the highest degree *disgraceful* in any man, be his religion what it may, to change it, I cannot conceive they would express *a willingness* to listen to addresses on Christianity.

Their two first Missionaries Mr. Carey and Mr. Moore went to Bengal in a Danish ship, in the spring of the year 1793.

" We were not insensible (say the Committee) that by such a mode of going out, they might be exposed to inconveniences ; and had it been in our power to have sent them otherwise, we should gladly have done so. But as there was no hope of this, we were reduced to the alternative, either to desist from what we considered our duty to God, or to comply

with it, *and risk the consequences.* We chose the latter, *as being the principle on which the first Christian Missionaries went forth to evangelize all nations.*

This is indeed a most alarming principle to adopt *in these days,* and if it meets the assent of the Company and the legislature, we may bid adieu to India.

We all know that the holy apostles (who in modern cant, are styled *the first Christian Missionaries)* were expressly commanded by our Blessed Saviour to preach the Gospel to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. In pursuance of this divine command, endowed as they afterwards were, with the gift of languages, and the power of working miracles, the holy Apostles did preach the Gospel to all nations then known in the world. They broke the laws of the different countries they visited, they boldly, and most properly despised the orders of men. They suffered stripes and tortures, they were imprisoned, and miraculously released : St. Paul was shipwrecked and escaped : and when they had courageously and successfully fulfilled the divine command for a series of years, each holy apostle obtained the crown of martyrdom, and

an eternal reward for their obedience, from the Almighty.

But if *modern enthusiasts*, by changing the old term Apostle, to that of Missionary, conceive that every thing done by the Holy Apostles may be done by Missionaries, what is to become of the country? Are Missionaries to set human laws at defiance, because the Apostles by divine command did so? Are not we Christians expressly directed to *obey* the powers *that be*?

In a subsequent paragraph the Committee profess not to know the legal power vested in the Company, but they "could not *suppose* it was the intention of the Legislature *to invest it with authority to exclude the Christian religion from India.*"

What absurd nonsense is this, and how contradictory to the preceding paragraph! What consequence was risqued by sending out Mr. Carey and Mr. Thomas in a Danish ship, except this? That as they were *smuggled out to India*, they were liable instantly to be sent back as every British subject is, who goes to India, without the consent of the East India Com-

pany. Such is *the law of the land,* originating as we must suppose, until the law is repealed, in motives of sound policy.

Prior to 1793, *not one British subject* had gone to India *as a Missionary,* and as the Directors *are members of the Church of England,* if a Sectarian Society had asked their permission to send Mr. Carey and Mr. Thomas to India, I think they would naturally have required a recommendation from the prelates of our Church, before they gave them permission to proceed to India in an English, or a Danish ship. I do not believe that *one* of the twenty-five Sectarian Missionaries now in India, went out with the knowledge and approbation of the East India Company.

If the Sectarian Societies conceive that the law as it now stands, which is imperative upon *all British subjects,* ought to be relaxed as applied to their Missionaries, why do they not apply to the legislature, for a partial repeal of the law? In every instance that they have smuggled out a Missionary, they have violated the law.

And in this place I must beg leave to

say a word or two as to Missionary Societies.

In 1701, a most respectable Society, of members *of the Church of England,* was incorporated by charter, for the propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts. Of this Society the Archbishop of Canterbury is president. It does not appear that this venerable Society has employed Missionaries in India at any period, nor that it has ever afforded pecuniary assistance to the Sectarian Missionaries in India.

"The Society for promoting Christian Knowledge" which is a Society of our Church also, was established in 1699. This Society the Rev. Basil Wood says in his sermon, maintains seven Missionaries, *five of whom are in the East Indies,* and he adds that this Society had the honour of employing Mr. Scwartz. I have every reason to believe, after a full enquiry, that Mr. Wood is in an error. I cannot discover that the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, has now or ever had *a single Missionary in India.* The Society did, as I am informed, afford some pecuniary assistance to Mr. Scwartz, and other Danish Missionaries,

but these respectable men were in the employ of the King of Denmark, or his subjects. I have looked at the annual account of the two Calvinist Societies, the Baptist, and the Missionary Society, and though they have, including Brother Chater and Brother Robinson, twenty-five Missionaries in India, it does not appear that either of the venerable Societies in our Church have offered them the smallest support or assistance.

From 1799 to 1792, a period of nearly one hundred years, it does not appear, as far as I can understand, that a missionary mania was prevalent in the United Kingdom.

But in 1792, the Baptist Society was formed, and every thing that was done by our Holy Apostles, for the propagation of the Gospel of Christ, acting as they were *by divine command*, was deemed not only *lawful*, but an imperious duty imposed upon us.

" Wo be unto us, if we do not preach the Gospel," is the quotation of the Baptist Missionaries, not meaning, Wo will be unto them if they preach false doctrine, but if they do not preach the Gospel to heathen nations.

Wo, then will be the portion of our fathers, and of the Church of England, because from the æra of the reformation to the present day, this indispensible duty to God has been most shamefully neglected.

In 1795, another Society was formed, called the Missionary Society, but better known by the name of the London Missionary Society. The principles of the two Societies are exactly similar. They are Calvinistic. The Coast Missionaries denominate those Christians who differ from them, "nominal Christians," the cant so common now in England.

The Bengal Missionaries say, "we are *sure*, that *only those*, who are *ordained to eternal life will believe.*" Were they to say so, to a Hindoo convert of *talents* and *character*, I think his answer would be that their Missionary exertions were useless, because if he was *ordained to eternal life*, no human information was necessary to him. It would take more time than the Missionaries could spare, to make a Hindoo comprehend the doctrines of predestination, election, grace, and free-will.

A third Society was instituted in 1800, en-

titled " the Society for Missions to Africa and the East. But it does not appear that this Society has hitherto sent a Missionary to the East Indies.

There is also an Arminian Methodist Society, and a Society of the United Brethren, whose Missionaries are well employed in Pagan countries; but they have wisely refrained from sending Missionaries to India, where they could be of no service.

These Societies and their supporters are very fond of leaning upon the Church of England, when any purpose is to be answered by it. Thus we are reminded that there are two *venerable Societies* for the propagation of the Gospel, and for promoting Christian knowledge, established above a century ago. Certainly there are, and where is the man who has presumed to censure the conduct of those venerable Societies in a single instance? If the members of those Societies conceived the conversion of the immense population of Hindostan to be *practicable*, they would not degrade their characters by acting year after year in open violation of the law. They would apply directly to the East India Company for permission

to send as many Missionaries as they chose to India, and if permission was refused, they would appeal to the Legislature. *Their Missionaries* would not teach the mystic doctrines of Calvinism, nor would they tell Mahomedans and Hindoos, that before any one amongst them was born, God had determined whether they should be saved, or perish everlastingly. What is it that these venerable Societies have done as to India? I believe they gave some pecuniary assistance to a German Missionary in 1717, and 1727, and the Archbishop of Canterbury of those days wrote a letter to that Missionary. One of the two venerable Societies gave some pecuniary assistance also to Mr. Scwartz and the other members of the *Danish Mission* in India. I cannot discover that they have given the smallest pecuniary assistance to the Sectarian Societies of this day, nor can I find the name of a single prelate or dignitary of the Church amongst the list of subscribers to the "Baptist Society," "The Missionary Society," or the "Society for Missions to Africa and the East."

The Committee of the Baptist Society state "that until the autumn of 1805, Government was kindly disposed towards the Missionaries,

and were willing to give every facility to their labours, short of authoritative patronage, which was not desired." In so doing the Bengal Government acted, *as it always had done* ; "from the autumn of 1805, however, they began to be treated by the *country magistrates in a different manner* ; once they were interrupted when *distributing* tracts, and *sent home*."

This is the *gentle mode*, in which the Baptist Committee state the transaction that first attracted the attention of Government. Mr. Carey and Mr. Moore went to Dacca, one of the most populous cities in Bengal, *in the autumn of* 1805. They had no *passport*, which was a direct breach of the law. They distributed upwards of four thousand religious tracts in a few hours in the environs of the city, and the next day they were told by the *magistrate* and *collector*, two English gentlemen who possessed the whole civil authority of Government in a rich and populous province, that their distribution of tracts had caused considerable uneasiness among the people, they were prohibited from making any further distribution, and they asked if they knew the consequence of an European travelling through the country *without a passport*.

"This *interruption* occasioned an application from the Missionaries to Government, for permission to *itinerate*, and *to form stations in* the country, *the request was not granted;* but his Excellency Sir George Barlow, in a public speech since printed, acknowledged with approbation, the Society of Protestant Missionaries at Serampore." This is confounding points that are totally *distinct*. The speech of Sir George Barlow above alluded to, was made long *prior to the autumn of* 1805, and applied to those Missionaries, Mr. Carey and others who had distinguished themselves as good scholars *in the native languages*, and it was made at an examination of the young gentlemen of the college of Fort William. But in the autumn of 1805, they were *refused* permission to *itinerate*, or to form stations in the country. The question then is, did the Missionaries obey the command? It is in proof *they did not*. In October 1805, after Sir George Barlow in consequence of Lord Cornwallis's death had quitted Calcutta, Mr. Marden *itinerated* to the Sunderbunds. In November Mr. Marden and Mr. Ward *itinerated* to *Jessore*, and had actually purchased a spot of ground *for a Missionary station*, but the natives compelled them to cancel the agreement.

In November, Mr. Chamberlain itinerated to *Cutwa,* distributed some thousands of religious tracts, and preached before some thousands of the natives; in a country so populous that in a circuit of six miles, there are a hundred thousand souls.

In January 1806, a distinct church was formed at Dinagepore, and two Missionaries sent to that province.

In April 1806, Mr. Chamberlain *again itinerated to Cutwa.*

These were acts, *in direct disobedience of the orders of Government.* Ignorance could not be pleaded, because prior to Sir George Barlow quitting the seat of Government, they had asked permission to itinerate and to form stations, *and the permission was not granted.* It was late in April 1806, I believe, before Sir George Barlow returned to Calcutta.

In August, 1806, the Governor-General deemed it necessary to take up this subject very seriously indeed, as appears by the statement of the Baptist Committee, for I have no other authority for saying so.

The prohibition as to the natives preaching the Gospel, was I presume owing to what occurred almost under the eye of Sir George Barlow. The contest as to the two new Missionaries, Mr. Chater and Mr. Robinson, might have caused a very serious difference with Denmark and America, and in addition there was a very considerable alarm throughout India, in consequence of the mutiny at Vellore. The Baptist Committee have the following remark: " Loose *rumours* have indeed been circulated both *in India,* and *in England* that *their exertions* had some influence in producing the tragical mutiny at Vellore." And again, " such rumours therefore prove nothing, except it be the want of better evidence or a desire to catch at something which *may be turned against Christianity,* or a wish to shift the blame of a melancholy catastrophe."

The Committee assign unanswerable reasons in order to prove that the Bengal Missionaries, could not by their conduct have influenced in the slightest degree, the mutiny at Vellore.

But here they suppose an accusation to have

been brought against the *Bengal Missionaries*, which no man living ever did prefer amongst them. There has been most wonderful ingenuity displayed in an attempt to confound the plain understandings of men on this subject. The rumour general throughout India in 1806, was this, that the native troops on the Coast, had been induced by factious and discontented men to *believe* that it was the determination of the British Government to compel them to embrace Christianity. That to induce the native troops to credit so absurd a rumour, they were reminded of the orders for a change in their dress, of the increase of Missionaries, of the institution of schools, for the purpose of educating as Christians the children of the Hindoos and Mahomedans, of the gratuitous circulation of the Scriptures, and knowing, as I do, the excessive jealousy of the natives of India, as to every thing connected with their religion and their local customs, I must repeat that it was not an *irrational* conclusion, though so false a one, for them to come to. With the example of what had recently happened on the Coast before him, it surely was very wise in Sir George Barlow to interfere as he did. From the autumn of 1805, to June 1806, the Missionaries appear to have acted like nine mad-

men. They disobeyed the orders of the Governor-General by *itinerating*, and by attempting to fix *Missionary stations*, in different parts of Bengal, although positively prohibited from so doing. They acted in open defiance of the British Government, by setting up the protection of Denmark, in opposition to the lawful authority of the Governor-General, who wished to send two men back to England, who had no legal right to remain in Bengal for an hour.

Sir George Barlow appears to have viewed the conduct of these Missionaries in Bengal, precisely in the same light that I viewed it in here. But can any man say that he wished "to crush Christianity *in India.*" The Conductors of the Christian Observer and the Rev. Mr. Owen, may possibly now calumniate him, as they have calumniated me. No British subject can possibly wish to crush Christianity in India nor to prevent its extension. Sir George Barlow approved of the translation of the Scriptures, which had been commenced long before he succeeded to the Government. He permitted voluntary subscriptions to be solicited by public advertisement, but he would not allow *a committee* to be appointed

for superintending the translation, because as it is evident, that would have been deemed an *interference* on the part of *Government.* His words as the Committee quote them were, "*Let the Missionaries go on in their present line of conduct,*" an undoubted proof, if proof were necessary, that he made this remark *prior to the autumn of* 1805.

The Missionaries by the Report of the Baptist Committee appear to be restrained from preaching, except at Serampore, and in their house in Calcutta. Their native converts are prohibited from preaching any where. The Missionaries are prohibited from distributing religious tracts, abusing the religion of the Hindoos. They are not allowed to *itinerate,* nor to form Missionary stations in the country.

Surely these are not " acts of severity, as the gentleman calls them so improperly. They impose no hardship of any kind upon the Missionaries. They, it is true, prevent them from doing what *they* suppose to be their duty *to God* in India. But other parts of the world are still open to them. If a *sin* is committed, the responsible persons, are the Governor-General and Council of Bengal. If their regulations are *confirmed,* which I am most confident they

ither have been, or will be, from hence, the sin if any, will be at the door of the British nation. The Missionaries, if I read the Baptist Committee Report right, have no separate fund, and the salary of eight hundred pounds a year, which Mr. Carey receives from the East India Company, is thrown into the common stock purse at Serampore.

General Maitland the Governor of Ceylon banished every Missionary from that island. The Governor-General and Council of Bengal have even gone beyond former Governments, they have not permitted the Baptist Missionaries to *itinerate*. This liberty was allowed to Mr. Kiernander a Danish Missionary in my time, and to Padre Juan the Roman Missionary. But is there a candid, a fair, or an honourable man who will suppose that either the Bengal Government, or the King's Governor of Ceylon, were *hostile to Christianity*, because they conceived regulation to be absolutely necessary?

Did the English Missionaries, act as the Danish and Roman Missionary acted in Bengal? We never heard of their preaching in the provinces, nor of their distributing reli-

gious tracts, abusing the religion of the Hindoos, nor of the preaching of their native converts in Hindoo temples.

Yet the Baptist Statement quotes a declaration of Sir George Barlow to the Missionaries, " Let the Missionaries go on, *in their present line* of conduct," as if it were made at the very moment that he thought it necessary to direct them to *abandon* the line of conduct they had pursued for many months.

The gentleman will see from the Baptist Statement, that Sir George Barlow has positively restricted the Missionaries within bounds, that prevent future danger to the state.

But what opinion do the Missionaries give us, of the restrictive resolutions of the Bengal Government ?

" If there were a hundred Missionaries spread over Bengal, each attended with a train of loyal, pious, and faithful disciples, *they would endear the inhabitants to us.* What were the advantages derived *from one Scwartz in the Mysore country?*" None whatever.

From his strong attachment to the British Government, and from the regard which the raja of *Tanjore* had for him, he was of essential service by his hearty co-operation with the English resident at Tanjore; but it was as *a man,* not as a *Missionary* that he was esteemed by the sovereign of Tanjore, and of service to us.

Our Government by Dr. Buchanan's admission is deemed a blessing by the natives who bend submissively to our mild sway. It would be the conclusion of men of common sense, that nothing should be hazarded, which might by possibility tend to disturb this internal tranquillity and general satisfaction. But these Missionaries conceive that the inhabitants would be *endeared* to us, if there were one hundred English Missionaries each attended by his train of native converts, spread over the country.

Will the gentleman tell me upon what principle it is that he censures me so violently for having given my opinion of men, who make no scruple themselves of opposing their private sentiments to a decision of the Government which protects them?

The Missionaries are now prohibited from distributing tracts "abusing the religion of the Hindoos," the words of the Governor-General's message. The Baptist committee subjoin a note in which they observe that "the term abusing is *inapplicable*." Their tracts, they say, "tend no doubt to overturn *idolatry*, but *not by abuse*." Will the gentleman then tell me what abuse is? Suppose the Hindoos were to say to us, that our Holy Gospel is idolatrous, and immoral, and only fit for the amusement of women and children, they being the *governing power*, we should surely term it gross and scandalous abuse. Under subjection, as they are, the abuse of the Missionaries occasioned the indecency of our Holy Gospel being abused, by Hindoos, in presence of one of the Missionaries.

The Baptist committee refer *to the* printed rules of the Missionaries in the same note. These rules prescribe to them, "to treat the natives with gentleness and affection, knowing that the *real conquests* of the Gospel *are those of love*."

The rule is indeed most excellent. It was strictly observed by Mr. Scwartz, though he was no party to it, and by the observance of

the rule, though it could not produce good converts, it made him in very high estimation amongst the natives. But what was denounced by these Calvinist Missionaries in one of their tracts? the eternity of hell torments, to those who should not embrace Christianity. What was the denunciation of Mr. Marshman in his sermon at Saugor, everlasting damnation, to an immense multitude, if having then for the *first time* heard the Gospel, they should be so imprudent as to reject it. The Baptist Committee at the close of their remarks say, "we hope for the honour and *security* of our country, that *persecution* for religion will never be revived *in it*, or in any of its dependences; and that if any question is brought forward it will not be, whether the door shall be shut *against the admission of Christianity into British India*."

Although so many of these Missionaries, if not the whole of them, violated the law by the mode in which they got out to India, have they suffered *persecution* of any kind?—have they been prevented from performing their devotions, or from preaching or praying in their own church to those of their own persuasion, or to any who might wish to hear them either at Serampore, or in their own house at Cal-

cutta? It cannot be *persecution* for the British government in India, consulting the safety of the state, to say no native convert shall preach in future—no Missionary shall preach out of his own church or his own house—he shall not itinerate, nor shall he form Missionary stations in different parts of Bengal. The Missionaries conceive not only that the Gospel may be preached with success, if they and their native converts are allowed to go where they please, but that great *political advantages* would result from the dispersion of one hundred Missionaries, each attended by a train of native disciples, throughout the whole country. Who is to decide, where the difference of opinion is so great, but the *government*, to whom the preservation of India is intrusted?—Who is to confirm, or to change the decision they have come to, and acted firmly upon, but the government *at home?*

The door is not shut against the admission of Christianity into India; it never can be proposed to shut it. But it ever must be a question, to what length individuals may be allowed to go, *in order to extend Christianity in India.* Already a clear line has been drawn by the Government of Bengal. Already the Directors, as I now understand, *have* sent instructions to India, relative to the Missionaries. I

can assure the gentleman that I gained my knowledge from no *private channels.* The statement which he referred me to, gave me the first knowledge I had of the interference of the Bengal Government; and that the Court of Directors have sent out strong instructions and orders, was a fact, as I understand, communicated by authority to Mr. Twining, with full liberty to make it public.

The gentleman says that though I promised to submit a plan to the consideration of the Company, the King's Ministers, and the Legislature, he cannot discover it in the Preface.

The Reverend Mr. Owen was not so shortsighted. He discovered it, and he has misrepresented "my remedial edict," as he calls it, which in fact, did not go very far *beyond* what has already been done by the Bengal Government. The Bengal Government prescribed strict rules for the conduct of the English Missionaries, I proposed *their recal.* I am still more confirmed in my opinion that they ought to be recalled, from a perusal of the Baptist statement which the gentleman referred me to. By that, it appears, that in the autumn of 1805, after Mr. Carey and Mr. Moore, two clergymen, as the gentleman calls them, were driven from Dacca by the magis-

trate and collector, the Missionaries applied to Government for permission to *itinerate*, and to form *Missionary stations in the country*. Their request was *refused*. But subsequent to the autumn of 1805, they did *itinerate*, and they did attempt to form Missionary stations at Cutwa and Jessore. The gentleman if he has been twenty years in India, must know that Government expects implicit obedience to its orders, from every British subject. If those who get out to India contrary to law, and who reside there by sufferance, are to disobey orders with impunity, how can the government of an immense empire be properly conducted?

My authority for stating that they did disobey orders, is the 16th Baptist Report, and the statement of the Baptist Committee. In the latter it appears that in the autumn of 1805, they were refused permission to itinerate or to form Missionary stations in the country. By the former it appears that they did *itinerate* in October, November, and December 1805, in January and April 1806; the Governor-General being absent from Calcutta during the whole period.

The other part of my "remedial edict," respected the printing and *gratuitous* circulation

of our Holy Scriptures. Here it seems I thought precisely as Sir George Barlow had thought upon the subject; he would not permit *a committee* to superintend the translation, or the *printing*, because either the one or the other would, as he observed, be an *interference*.

The gentleman speaks of the *severity* of the Bengal Government. What does he mean by *severity?* Is regulation, for the safety of the state, to be called *severity?* Were the Missionaries deprived of personal liberty? Were they ordered to quit Bengal? Wo be to us, say the Missionaries, if we preach not the gospel! What wo can be to them, if they are forbidden to preach the gospel *as they chuse*. There are other parts of the world in which they may preach it. The King's Governor of Ceylon has gone the full length of my recommendations. He has sent every Missionary from that island, not from caprice, not from hostility to Christianity, but because he conceived the public safety rendered the measure necessary. From the same motive, I recommended the recal of the English Missionaries from India.

The conductors of the Christian Observer have just published a critique on my pamphlet,

and the Letter to the Reverend Mr. Owen. They have done me ample justice, by retracting the opinion which they had too hastily formed, and too warmly expressed. I am therefore not disposed to continue a contest, which at all events is no longer necessary. The conductors have now acted as fair critics should always act. They say, that as I have so liberally applied the terms madman, maniac, and enthusiast to the Missionaries, and have taken such liberties with the names of Drs. Buchanan and Kerr, I have no right to complain of the treatment which I have received in return. But, with submission to these gentlemen, they do not state the case fairly. Before I presumed to censure the Missionaries, or Doctors Buchanan and Kerr, I inserted the public documents on which that censure was grounded. It was perfectly open to the conductors of the Christian Observer, or any of those who are of a different opinion from me, to say, that the documents I produced, did not warrant my conclusions, and then they might with justice have said,

"Mutato nomine, de *te* fabula narratur."

But instead of combating my reasoning they have severally said, that I was not a Christian, that I was hostile to Christianity, that I know nothing of the Scriptures, that I had abused and blasphemed the Scriptures, &c. &c.

I have not to complain of the critique last published in the Christian Observer. The conductors differ from me fairly on the subject of my Preface and the Letter to the Reverend Mr. Owen, and, as far as the time will permit, I will reply to their remarks.

They have quoted the late Bishop of St. Asaph's speech as it is published in Woodfall's Debates, where it was not only given totally wrong, but the Bishop is made to speak non-sense inapplicable to the subject of debate.

The substance of his speech is fairly given in Debrett's Debates. I heard him deliver it, and I am confident that those who were present at that time will admit that I have given it correctly. In some parts of the speech I believe it will be generally admitted, *even now*, that the Bishop was right. "The religion, the laws, and the local customs of India are so interwoven with each other, that it will be impossible to separate them."

"Providence has placed millions of people under our government, who for ages past have differed from us in religion, laws, and customs, and we are bound upon every principle of *jus-*

tice as well as *policy* to preserve to them the free exercise of each."

I do not find that the strongest advocates for missionary exertions in India, have a wish to dragoon the natives into a change of their religion, nor has any man attempted to prove that their laws and local customs are *not* so interwoven one with the other, as to make it impossible to separate them.

The Bishop, as the Conductors must know, was a prelate of intense application, and had a general thirst after knowledge. He was one of the most indefatigable and zealous supporters of Mr. Wilberforce's plan for the abolition of the slave trade in the House of Lords. He was a constant attendant on the trial of Mr. Hastings, and had taken as much pains to be thoroughly acquainted with the affairs of India, as any man I ever conversed with.

But there was another part of the Bishop's speech, to which no reply was made at the time, because the missionary mania, as I must call it, has wonderfully increased since the year 1793.

" There is no *obligation* upon us as Chris-

tians, to attempt the conversion of the natives of *India*." Mr. Woodfall has the words, that one *Foreign State* had no right to interfere with the government of another country, which makes the whole speech *nonsense*, although the Conductors think that the reasoning is somewhat *better* than that which I have insisted on as the Bishop's.

If Doctor Horsley had said nothing further, it might fairly be concluded that he made a distinction as to India, because the people of India were native British subjects, and therefore entitled to the free exercise of that religion and those laws and customs which they had possessed for so many ages. But in the latter part of his speech, which Mr. Woodfall has clearly given, it appears to have been the Bishop's opinion, that there was no *obligation* upon us as Christians, to attempt the conversion of any Heathen nation.

This opinion is strongly combated by the conductors of the Christian Observer, and I will not presume to dispute the justice of their arguments.

But if the Bishop stated the case strongly on the one side, the Sectarians go very great lengths

indeed on the other. They represent the attempt to evangelize the Heathen, as they call it, to be an "*indispensible duty.*" And by the manner in which they have acted, we may suppose that it is more meritorious in their opinion to evangelize one heathen, than to perform any other Christian duty. Their Missionaries are almost classed with the Holy Apostles. Their agents itinerate in Great Britain for the purpose of levying contributions, and from one poor man in Yorkshire, who with his wife had twenty-eight shillings a week, they obtained no less a sum than forty guineas.

Will the Christian Observer candidly tell me, whether the Church of England *by its practice* has not adopted the opinion of Dr. Horsley? Upon this subject I do not write with documents before me, as with respect to the Missionaries, and Doctors Buchanan and Kerr, if therefore, I am in an error, I shall be glad to be set right.

The two venerable societies of our church, established more than a century ago, do not appear to me, to have acted as if they conceived evangelizing the heathen to be, "an indispensible duty."

If I were to give credit to the Reverend Basil Wood, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel maintains seventy-five Missionaries and Catechists chiefly in North America. What proportion the Catechists bore to the Missionaries, he does not tell us. It is to be presumed, I suppose, that these men are employed in evangelizing the savages of North America.

The Church Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, maintains, as Mr. Wood says, in his sermon, seven Missionaries, five of whom are in India. In what part of India they are I have not been able to discover.

What I have always understood is, that the two venerable societies of our church never did send a single Missionary to India, but that they gave some pecuniary assistance to Missionaries appointed by the crown of Denmark, or by a Missionary society at Copenhagen. It cannot fairly be said that Mr. Sewartz and Mr. Gerrick on the coast, or Mr. Kiernander in Bengal, were *employed* by the venerable Society for promoting Christian knowledge, merely because that society afforded them pecuniary assistance.

It does not appear that either of the societies of our church has afforded any countenance or assistance to the various Sectarian Missionary Societies of modern date, for such they all are.

The church of England, therefore, I am entitled to say, has by its *practice* adopted the opinion of Doctor Horsley, that there is no *obligation* upon us as Christians, to go much out of our way, in the hope of evangelizing the Heathen.

I have looked over the list of Subscribers to the two Calvinist societies who at this moment maintain twenty-five Missionaries in India, but I cannot find the name of one prelate, or of one dignitary of the church amongst them, and very few names indeed of the inferior clergy, and those, as far as I can discover, are of that description of our clergy, who are termed evangelical.

I am therefore entitled to say, until the contrary is proved, that our church does not deem it to be "an indispensible duty, enjoined to Christians by the Almighty," to evangelize the Heathen nations.

How very *modern* is the discovery we have made as to this "indispensible duty." The "Baptist Society" was not instituted until 1792. The "Missionary Society" of London was not instituted until 1795, and the "Society for Missions to Africa and the East," was not instituted until 1800. A sober Protestant of the good old church of England, is not surely obliged to conform to every new fashion in religion, as he must with respect to the cut of his coat, if he mixes in good society.

As the Arminian Methodist, and the United Brethren Missionary Societies do not send Missionaries to India, I have not looked into their reports, but I am told that those societies are of modern date also.

The conductors of the Christian Observer, have really in general so fairly criticised my productions, that I am anxious to convince them they have been mistaken in certain points.

I can assure them that I have not retracted, *sub silentio*, a single opinion that I have given.

The proof of inconsistency or of a change of

opinion is attempted to be established, by quoting one passage from the Preface, and a second from my Letter to the Reverend Mr. Owen:

In the Preface I say, " I much doubt whether we can be justified in attempting to convert the people of India, were it probable even that we could succeed at any distant period of time."

This passage without my admission of the truth of an observation in the Christian Observer, that I have written in a very desultory manner, though the observation is very just, applied most evidently to the clauses proposed in Parliament for the institution of Free-Schools, and the public appointment of Missionaries, by a solemn act of the Legislature, for the express object of converting the natives *at some distant period of time.*

In the Letter to Mr. Owen I observe, " But upon Christian principles I do hold it to be our duty to encourage Christianity, where success is *practicable.*"

" Would it be possible for the very spirit of contradiction to oppose and gainsay itself in

a more marvellous manner?" is the observation of the conductors of the Christian Observer, who at the same time have the candour to confess that the difference between the two pamphlets is not *very considerable in the mass.*

Yet if the preceding remark is correct, the difference is very considerable indeed. But the fact is, that neither in the Preface, the Observations, or in my Letter to the Reverend Mr. Owen, have I objected to the utmost exertions that Missionaries can use, to the translation of our Holy Scriptures, or to a liberal distribution of them, and if by those means success is practicable, it is I think our duty to *encourage* the spread of Christianity in India.

My opinion has never varied for an instant. I know that Protestant Missionaries have been for a century in India, and they may be there for centuries to come if we retain India for centuries, without doing any mischief, provided they are the pure inoffensive characters that they formerly were.

We could not be justified in adopting the clauses proposed in each house of Parliament, as I thought, and still think.

Mr. Owen, reasoning upon European principles, conceived it to be very desirable, in a *political* point of view, that the governors and governed should profess the same religion. I am clearly of opinion that in a *political point of view*, it is not desirable *in India;* "but upon Christian principles I do hold it to be our duty to encourage Christianity where success is *practicable.*" In India I do not think it practicable; but even there I do not object, in the Preface, the Observations, or in the Letter to Mr. Owen, either to the translation of our Holy Scriptures, or to the residence of prudent and inoffensive Missionaries. Do the conductors make no difference between our continuing in India, occasionally to make a convert, or, as one of the Sectarian Missionaries on the coast elegantly expresses it, "catching a Heathen in the Gospel net," and an extensive plan proposed with the view of evangelizing the immense population of Hindostan?

The conductors of the Christian Observer strenuously defend Mr. Ward's application of our Saviour's words, "Think you I am come to send peace on the earth? I tell you nay." They are fortified by great authorities. They admit that the Gospel in its own nature tends

to produce peace and good will, but they admit also that dissension will *occasionally* be the consequence of preaching the Gospel. This however, was not the case until Calvinist Missionaries went to India, and if it be true, that dissensions must of necessity occasionally arise, it becomes a very serious consideration indeed, to what extent in point of prudence and policy we can permit the Gospel to be preached to those who now are not Christians.

I cannot presume to contend with the Christian Observer on doctrinal points, but to me, every line in the Holy Gospel is as intelligible as it is perfect.

The Christian Observer defends Mr. Ward, because almost every commentator has affixed the same sense to the passage that Mr. Ward himself did; that they are *wrong* I am thoroughly convinced.

A whole village rises against certain native converts in Bengal: Mr. Ward states the fact, and then adds these words used by our Blessed Saviour, "Think you I am come to send peace on the earth? I tell you nay."

Looking to the context we find that our Blessed Lord goes still further, that he came to excite dissension, that he came to send fire on the earth, &c. &c. expressions which it is *impossible* to reconcile to the whole scope and tenor of that Holy Gospel of peace, benevolence, meekness and good will, *provided* the prophecy be considered as applying to *all nations*, and *to all periods*.

The Christian Observer says, however, "It is true that some commentators refer these words not to the *earth* but to the *land*, that is, *the land* of *Jerusalem*." With these commentators I entirely agree, and although the Christian Observer adds, "that this can only confine the *scene* of the prophecy, not alter the sense," I think it does completely change the *sense* in which Mr. Ward, the Christian Observer, Poole, Burkit, and many other commentators have understood the prophecy in.

Our Lord came to his own, and his own received him not. He was despised, rejected, although he daily performed miracles in presence of so many of the Jews, and gave irrefragable proofs that he was the true Messiah.

Then indeed he did prophecy the destruction of Jerusalem, and the precise period of that event, and every expression used by him had a reference to the *land of Jerusalem,* from the period in which he spoke, to the day of the extinction of the Jews as a nation, and then the prophecy *was accomplished.*

But if this common sense, and as I am convinced this true interpretation of the prophecy is rejected, and the interpretation of the Christian Observer and other commentators is admitted, the Spaniards may be completely justified for the horrible cruelties they committed on the discovery of the New World in propagating the Gospel. The Inquisition may be justified. Calvin may be justified for the murder of Servetus. The difference is in the *degree* to which the cruelties extended, but the *principle* is the same. A Romish priest when an unfortunate Peruvian was tied to the stake might have told him, that he did not come to bring *peace* upon the earth, with just as much propriety as Mr. Ward made use of the words, when a village rose against his native converts, and an inquisitor might have told his miserable victims, that he was come " to send fire on

the earth." It is impossible to reconcile the prophecy of our Blessed Saviour to all the rest of his Holy Gospel, if we apply it to the *whole world,* and to *all periods.*

The Christian Observer says, " Mr. Ward, perceiving that his *pacific mission* had in a particular instance excited *dissention,* most innocently and most naturally, as we conceive, refers to a prediction of our Blessed Saviour, that such should *occasionally* be the consequence of the preaching of that Gospel, which in its own nature tends to produce peace and good will."

Is this, I seriously ask the Christian Observer, a true way of explaining the prediction of our Blessed Saviour? Our Lord invariably speaks so intelligibly and so forcibly, that his meaning cannot be mistaken—That he was not sent to bring *peace* on the earth—That he was come to send fire on the earth—to cause divisions, &c. &c. are expressions which cannot be explained away fairly as Poole and other commentators attempt to explain them away.

If they are allowed to apply to *all periods,*

and to *all countries,* every cruelty, every enormity committed in order to propagate Christianity may be justified.

Wisely indeed has the Bengal Government restricted the Missionaries from itinerating. If they conceive that they are not sent to bring *peace* to India, they ought to be confined to one spot.

The conductors of the Christian Observer, very fairly and very candidly admit, that "*much caution is necessary* in prosecuting *the work of conversion in India,*" and they add, "*that they cannot acquit the Baptist Missionaries* of committing occasional indiscretions."

We are therefore *at last* come to a right understanding, and I wish the Christian Observer would point out the *real difference* between us. I accused not the Missionaries of committing any crime of any kind; for I did not know they had disobeyed the orders of Government, which were *positive* that they should not itinerate, nor attempt to form Missionary stations in Bengal; nor did I know that they had been in what I call actual rebellion

against Government, when I proposed their recal. But I did propose it, because I thought the safety of the *state* required so strong a measure. The Christian Observer admits *occasional indiscretions,* and admits also *that the greatest caution is necessary;* we therefore only differ as to the *extent* to which that caution should be carried.

And yet in other parts of the critique, they seem to think that these Missionaries were harshly treated at Dacca, and at Dinagepore. I am asked if I ever witnessed an instance of that rigour being shown to travellers unprovided with passports, which the Missionaries experienced at Dacca, and some of them as they understand at Dinagepore?—I can assure them I have, and so I am positive every gentleman who has been in the service since 1765 has. It was the late Lord Clive who in that year published the order that no European should be allowed to go into the interior of Bengal *without a passport,* on pain of being sent under a guard to Calcutta.

If the conductors are disposed to inquire, and wish to know the truth, I shall be very happy to go along with them. Will they tell me

what was the rigour with which the Missionaries were treated at Dacca? They were not by their own accounts, even ordered to quit the city. They were *prohibited* from distributing any more of their abusive religious tracts, and then as they say, finding they could do *no good*, they returned to Serampore.

At Dinagepore, I should suppose, for I know not the fact, that they were treated more roughly, and most deservedly so. In the autumn of 1805 they were prohibited by the Governor General from itinerating or forming Missionary stations in the country. In January 1806 in direct disobedience of the orders of Government, these Missionaries formed a *separate church* at Dinagepore, a province more than two hundred miles from Calcutta, and on Sir George Barlow's return to the seat of Government, I think it highly probable, that he ordered the Missionaries to be sent instantly from Dinagepore to Calcutta.

I have read the critique of the Christian Observer with the greatest attention, and should be most ready to confess that I had formed an erroneous opinion, if by their reasoning I had been convinced that such was the fact.

When they produce what they have promised, an account of the converts to Christianity, if I find amongst them a *single man* of *talents* and *character*, I will believe that in the lapse of ages, a small proportion of the immense population of Hindostan may be converted to Christianity *by human means*. By the out-pouring of the Spirit, the Almighty can do that in an instant which *man* can *never* accomplish. My present opinion is, that *not one good convert* has been made, and Doctor Kerr admits the general belief to be correct, that *few good converts have been made*, as late as the 7th of November 1806. I hold it *impossible* that the twenty-three Calvinist Missionaries in Bengal and on the coast should make *one good convert*. Some of them may have a facility in acquiring the knowledge of languages, and I dare say they are all very pious men, but they are narrow-minded, bigotted and ignorant notwithstanding, as I judge from their letters.

The conductors of the Christian Observer have totally mistaken what I said as to Dr. Buchanan in one instance. The Doctor says that if the British Parliament pleases, the destitute children of Hindoos and Mahomedans may be educated in the Christian religion.

The Christian Observer supposes that the destitute children here alluded to are those who in a season of distress are abandoned by their parents, or sold to Europeans. Where would be the necessity of applying to the British Parliament, if this was what he meant? We ought undoubtedly to breed up such children in the Christian religion; but the Company has no establishment for children of this description, and Europeans are not now allowed to purchase children from their parents.

The destitute children meant by Dr. Buchanan, as I suppose, are the children of Hindoo and Mahomedan Sepoys who have distinguished themselves, or who were killed on service, &c. Lord William Bentinck in his Proclamation mentions the provision made by the Company for children of this description, and if we were to make it a *condition* under the sanction of the British Parliament, that such children should be bred Christians, it would in my opinion be compulsion, because without our assistance they must perish for want. Considerable ingenuity has been displayed in defence of Dr. Kerr. But a man of plain sense, and common honesty can understand a plain case.

A school is established by a Christian school-master. A Hindoo is induced to send his son to that school to *learn the English language*, because it is *the key to fortune*. But the son is to be taught to despise the religion of his father, by having such books put into his hands as will shake his ridiculous and ill-founded prejudices to the very foundation, his conversion must be the consequence, and all this is to be done without any alarming attack directly on the religion of the father, who professes the religion of the nation. If this is not doing evil that good may come, I know not what doing evil is. It is carrying the doctrine of the Jesuits into practice, that the *end* sanctifies the *means*.

The father is not to be told that in teaching his son the English language, he will read books that may destroy his faith in the principles of Braminism; if the father were fairly told this, and then despised us so much as not to be afraid of trusting his son to learn English at a Christian school, we should be free from future reproach.

The character which the Christian Observer has given of the Company's servants in India, is

an imaginary one. Marquis Wellesley I am confident will tell the Conductors so. The first employment of a civil servant in Bengal is to perfect himself in the languages of the country. He is not competent to be appointed to any office until he can speak the country languages. He must be acquainted with the laws of the Koran and the Shastah before he can be appointed to any office in the judicial or the revenue line, and he must accurately study and know the character, manners, and customs of the people. Justice is administered to thirty millions of people, and the public revenues are collected also, by English gentlemen in the civil service of the East India Company in Bengal. The same system is exactly adopted now at Madras and Bombay, both for the administration of justice and the collection of the public revenue. Very many indeed of the military servants of the Company are distinguished for Oriental learning, and for their thorough knowledge of the manners, customs, and prejudices of the natives. But an itinerant Calvinist Missionary, is supposed by the conductors of the Christian Observer, to be the purest channel from which the British nation is to receive accurate information, respecting the character of the native population of Hindostan.

The Conductors say, that "of the present existence of any politico-religious alarm in India, neither Major Scott nor any body else can give the tittle of a proof, for we cannot condescend to fight against private letters, that are *talked of* but *never produced.* The mutiny at Vellore proves nothing, and that, for this *irresistible reason,* that there is not a Missionary within many miles of that place. On the contrary, *throughout Bengal,* where there are many active Missionaries, there never has been the slightest fear of a commotion among the native troops. What then becomes of the supposed horror of a compulsory conversion, which we are told, that the Missionaries every where inspire? To this enquiry, there is, we are confident, but one fair answer; and so firmly do we feel convinced of this, that we will not amplify the question, but leave it thus simply ennunciated, to the quiet consideration of Major Scott; not doubting *that it will greatly gravel him in the composition of his next pamphlet, which otherwise we suspect would very soon visit the world.*"

I can assure the Conductors that I never should have written a *second* pamphlet, had those who answered the first not travelled, as I

may say, *out of the indictment.* Had they merely combated *my arguments.* Why do I publish *a third time?*—Because an anonymous gentleman, who by his own account has been twenty years in India, has accused me of having been actuated by malice, rancour, and revenge in having written at all, has expressed first his suspicions, that I have no religion, and has afterwards insinuated, that I am a Roman Catholic. I am therefore glad of the opportunity which otherwise I should not have had, of fully answering those questions which the Christian Observer supposes would so greatly *gravel* me.

There is no necessity to appeal to the authority of private letters to prove the alarm and uneasiness which the Missionaries caused in India, from the 9th of July 1806, when the Vellore mutiny broke out, to the 23d of July 1807, because at present we have public documents in abundance, to put the credit due to those private letters beyond all doubt.

1st. The Proclamation of the Madras Government, issued on the 3d of December 1806.

2d. The expulsion of every Missionary from the island of Ceylon.

3d. The letter of Doctor Kerr to the Madras Government, in which he says, "*various reports* have been *industriously circulated* by *evil minded persons hostile to religion and its interests* that *the natives would be alarmed,* were *Missionaries* to be allowed to come out to India.

4th. The refusal of the Bengal Government in the autumn of 1805 of permission to the Missionaries, *to itinerate,* or to form *missionary stations* in Bengal.

5th. The determination of the Bengal Government not to clear an American ship, unless her captain engaged to take on board two English Missionaries who had violated the law, by coming to Calcutta in the American ship.

6th. The orders sent to the Missionaries in August 1806, prohibiting them from preaching, except in their church at Serampore, and in their house in Calcutta—prohibiting them from circulating abusive tracts, from itinerating, from forming Missionary stations in Bengal, and their native converts were prohibited from preaching in future.

These are *proofs* in abundance that the intelligence contained in private letters was correct. That alarm and uneasiness did exist in India, down to the 23d of July last, is beyond all doubt. Dr. Kerr admits the fact on that day—Whether the alarm was well or ill-founded is quite another question. I think it was well-founded; so thought the King's Governor of Ceylon, and so the Bengal Government thought, if I may judge from their public acts.

No man living ever did accuse the Missionaries of being in or near Vellore at any period. How far factious and discontented men made use of the Missionary exertions, and their increased numbers of late years, to create the mutiny, I have already explained.

Throughout Bengal, the Conductors say, "there are many *active Missionaries*, but there never has been the slightest fear of a mutiny of the native troops." Very true.—But to whom are we indebted for our safety?—To the prudence and the decision of the Bengal government. The army of Bengal is principally stationed on our northern frontiers, at the distance of seven, eight, and nine hundred miles

from Calcutta. The Missionaries with all their activity, and itinerating as they did against orders, in different parts of Bengal, did not visit one military station. Their abusive tracts were indeed distributed once at the military station at Berhampore amongst the native troops, and the copy now in England was given to his officer by one of our sepoys. Happily Sir George Barlow stopped the mischief in time.

I have now, I think, plainly and fairly answered the questions which were so greatly *to gravel me.*

By the last accounts from India, the Christian Observer says that even on the coast all was quiet. These accounts come down to the latter end of September 1807. But only two months before, Doctor Kerr admits that many persons had industriously circulated reports that the natives would be *alarmed* if Missionaries were allowed to come out to India. I take his *fact,* distinct from his abusive epithets; for he offers *no proof* that the persons were *evil-minded,* or *hostile to religion and its interests.* I believe the fact to be very true that late in September 1807, all was quiet on the

coast, and as I am confident that Sir George Barlow, who is now the Governor of Madras, will restrict the coast Missionaries and their converts from field preaching, and from distributing abusive tracts, it will ensure the future tranquillity of the country.

The Christian Observer says, that "of the *present existence* of any politico-religious alarm in India, neither Major Scott nor any body else, can give the tittle of a proof." Is that the question? The conductors who are accurate men, know that it is not. The question is, did, or did not a politico-religious alarm exist in India, from the 3d of July 1806, to the 23d of July 1807, when Doctor Kerr wrote his last report? and that it did exist is proved beyond all doubt.

What change *two months* may have made, I can only know from what I understand to be the declaration of Lord William Bentinck, that all was quiet on the coast and in every part of India when he left it, and I have entire confidence in the truth of his declaration.

The Christian Observer accuses me of injustice in noticing their remark, that those

who conceive Christianity to be God's best gift to man, will to *a man* oppose the renewal of the Company's charter, if it should appear that they *obstruct* the introduction of the Gospel into Hindostan. Yet they call upon every Proprietor to exercise *his unbiassed judgment.*

That Christianity is God's best gift to man, no Christian can possibly doubt. Upon principles of policy the *powerful body* to which the conductors alluded, now conceive that the charter ought to be renewed; but should the Company in exercising *its unbiassed judgment* not concur with *that powerful body,* as to *the extent* to which individuals may be allowed to go in order to *propagate* the Gospel in India, then they will to a *man* oppose the renewal of the charter. Such is the plain common sense mode of stating the reasoning of the Christian Observer, and I think it merits the remark which I made upon it. The Gospel has been *introduced* into India, for above fifteen centuries.

I am yet to learn the sentiments of that *powerful body,* on the restrictions under which Sir George Barlow has placed the Bengal Missionaries.

I am yet to learn what that powerful body thinks of the orders and instructions which the Directors have sent to India, and I am yet to learn their opinion of the conduct of his Majesty's Governor of Ceylon, in expelling every Missionary from that island.

If they do not *approve* of these acts, then the Company is to expect their hostility, and the King's Ministers must expect it also, because no order can be sent to India, relative to Missionaries, unless his Majesty's India Ministers concur with the directors as to the propriety of the order.

The Bengal Government in August 1806, appear to me to have had the same apprehensions that I strongly felt in December 1807. Unless the Christian Observer thinks so, will he account to me, upon what grounds they restricted the Baptist Missionaries from *itinerating* in future? No Danish, nor no Roman Missionary, in former days had been restricted from itinerating. The King's Governor of Ceylon certainly entertained similar apprehensions, or he would not have expelled every Missionary from that island.

In quoting the words of one of the Missionaries, which were that the appearance of one of them in a bigotted city would create "universal alarm," I substitute, *in another place*, "greatest alarm," evidently from not having always that page of the Baptist Report open before me, and the error is not of the smallest consequence.

I agree with the Christian Observer that the *Missionaries* did not intend to impute to the natives *any political alarm*, any dread of *compulsory conversion*.

I merely, as the Christian Observer says, accept *the fact* of the *alarm*, and I do put my own interpretation upon it. I agree also, that the question is left as it was before, open to discussion. I agree also, "that it would be rather hard to throw the Missionaries into the Ganges, and Doctor Buchanan under the feet of an elephant."

I merely proposed that the clergy of the church of England in India, should be directed in future to confine themselves to the performance of that duty for which they are paid by the East India Company; and I proposed

the recal of English Missionaries, who tell us that they cannot enter a bigotted city without creating "universal alarm." These are two propositions which the Christian Observer has an undoubted right to controvert in any way that he thinks proper. He may call them harsh, severe, unnecessary, unjust, or what he pleases, but he ought not to *change my propositions*. I not only concur with him in opinion that it would be rather hard to throw the Missionaries into the Ganges, or Dr. Buchanan under the feet of an elephant, but it would be more than hard, it would be deliberate and cruel murder.

The alarm of the natives was, as I think, "*political*." My reasons for thinking so I have fully stated, and certainly my opinion is not singular. I can conceive no possible motive to which the conduct of the Bengal Government and that of the Governor of Ceylon can be attributed, but one; which is, that the Missionaries had created *a political alarm* amongst the natives of Hindostan.

The conductors of the Christian Observer mention five most respectable names, and the heads of our two Universities, and they ask

me if I include them, amongst those whom I denounce *as* Puritans. Most assuredly I do not, nor has the Christian Observer a right from any thing that I have written to suppose that I do.

Mr. Wrangham's sermon I have read, and I admired it very much.

He confirms the fact which I have stated, when he says, "a century ago Denmark sent her teachers to a petty settlement on the coast of Coromandel; and as our merchants were not then princes, it appeared no derogation from our dignity, nor any impeachment of our munificence, *to give her a kind of subordinate support*."

If the venerable Societies of the Church of England have done *more* than to give a kind of *subordinate support* to the foreign Protestant Missionaries, formerly employed in India, Mr. Wrangham appears to be as ignorant of the fact as I am.

In another part of his Sermon, Mr. Wrangham says, "we neither court nor accept *sudden conversions*, for we do not, *like some of the Sec-*

taries of our own church, rely upon either their *sincerity* or their *stability.*"

Here also I perfectly agree with Mr. Wrangham, being fully convinced that the hundred converts made in thirteen years by the Bengal Missionaries, have injured the cause of Christianity in India. This also is the opinion of a very temperate writer who has addressed a letter to the President of the Board of Controul, on the subject of propagating Christianity in Indi.

In Mr. Wrangham's opinion, "we have in our moral account with the Hindoos, a heavy arrear to discharge, and if *our guilt* be measured by the importance of the duty *neglected,* the *magnitude of our means,* and the urgency of our motives, we may well tremble for the consequences of our eastern responsibility."

From the preceding passages it is clear that Mr. Wrangham thinks upon the subject as I do in many parts—That the conversion of the natives of India, should not be entrusted to the care *of Sectaries of our own church.* The church of England, under

the sanction of the Legislature, ought most undoubtedly to exert herself for the conversion of the population of Hindostan to Christianity, if the fact be as Mr. Wrangham supposes, that we do possess *the means* to accomplish so important an object. I am conscientiously convinced that we do not possess them; but the opinion of an individual is of no consequence: were the question to come fairly before the Legislature, I should bow to their decision were it to be contrary to my present opinion, because I am confident they would not decide to make the experiment, until convinced that success *was practicable*.

But I would wish to ask Mr. Wrangham, what are "the magnitude of our means," to which he alludes. Are they that we are the absolute sovereign of an empire, containing fifty millions of people, and does this absolute power give us *a right* to use compulsion? I am sure Mr. Wrangham abhors, as every Christian must, the idea of compulsion. My idea is, that our means for propagating Christianity in India *were more abundant* before we acquired an empire in India, than they are at *present*. We have now taken certain duties upon us. We are bound upon every principle of justice,

as well as policy, to preserve sacred and inviolate the religion, the laws, and local customs of our native subjects, until *they* express a wish to adopt our pure and holy religion. We can indeed translate our Holy Scriptures into the different languages of Hindostan. What was to prevent us from doing so, prior to our acquisition of empire in India? We can now only use our Holy Scriptures, as instruments of persuasion, before we acquired our Indian empire, we might have sent ten thousand Missionaries to India, provided we obtained the consent of the native sovereigns of the country. They might have itinerated from Lahore to Cape Comorin, each attended by a train of native converts, if they succeeded in making a train of converts. But now, as the Christian Observer admits, *the greatest caution is necessary,* whereas before we acquired empire, no caution of any kind was necessary. In the eye of reason and of common sense, therefore, our means are *diminished,* not *increased,* by our acquisition of empire in India. If Ceylon had not been a part of the British empire, the Sectarian Missionaries would have been now upon that island. If Bengal were not a part of the British empire, the Sectarian Missionaries would still have been allowed to

itinerate unless prohibited by the native sovereign.

Will the Christian Observer or Mr. Wrangham tell me what I am to understand by the "magnitude of our means," or what "*guilt*" we incur now, beyond what as a nation we have incured from the æra of the Reformation, by not adopting more active measures in the hope of evangelizing Heathen nations? It was only in the year 1792, that this sort of cant was introduced by Sectarians.

The Christian Observer refers with pleasure to the Anti-Jacobin Review, which treats with indignation the ignorance and the anti-christian spirit displayed by those who have the effrontery to avow an opinion, that the introduction of Christianity among the natives of India would only tend to produce a spirit of insubordination, and to render them troublesome subjects. Doctor Buchanan supposed that the conversion of fifty millions of people, the native subjects of the British empire in India, was very practicable, and he even carries it to the remaining fifty millions inhabiting Hindostan, because we have an influence over the sovereigns of those fifty millions. The idea indeed is so

wild, as I think, that it is ridiculous almost to reason upon it. But I do not mention it, to derogate from Christianity; on the contrary, I mention it in honour of Christianity; that one hundred, or fifty millions of Christians would not submit to be ruled by thirty thousand *foreigners*, recruited annually from two islands, at the distance by sea, of twelve thousand miles from the shores of India, although those foreigners were Christians also. If my opinion is disputed, I wish the Christian Observer or the Anti-Jacobin Review would state the grounds on which it is disputed.

Again it is said, "are men fit to be entrusted with the government of such a country, who seem to think the *souls* of their fellow creatures objects of no concern, and wholly beneath their notice?"

Who are the men now entrusted with the government of India, or at any period entrusted with it, who do hold this opinion?

Again the Anti-Jacobin Review says, "When our present religious Sovereign, when the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, whose deep concern for the interest of religion intitles him

to the respect of every religious mind, shall come fully to *know the real state of the case*, some step or other will be taken for wiping off this foul stain from our national character."

What does the Anti-Jacobin mean by the *real state of the case?* Does he suppose that his Majesty is uninformed of the real state of fifty millions of his native subjects? Has he not from the throne recommended it to the Legislature to consider, more than once or twice, how India could be best held and governed, for the ease, welfare, and happiness of the people, and for the honour and advantage of Great Britain? The empire of India has been acquired and augmented during his Majesty's reign. Committees of the House of Commons upon the affairs of India were appointed in 1772, 1773, 1781, 1782, 1783, and 1784. Repeated acts of Parliament have been passed, and in 1784, the responsible controul for the good government of India was transferred from the Company to the Crown, in whose hands it has remained from 1784 to this day. It is idle and ridiculous therefore to suppose that his Majesty, or the Chancellor of the Exchequer, do not know *the real state of the case*. What *foul stain* is to be wiped off from our national

character with respect to India? This is mere *verbiage :* it leads to nothing.

Is it a stain upon our national character that Parliament and the Church of England have not adopted means to convert the population of Hindostan to Christianity? Why not say so at once, and why do not those who think it a stain upon the character of the nation, bring the subject before Parliament? It may be done by the Church, it may be done by any individual member.

In 1773 a regulating act was passed which occasioned much discussion in Parliament, but not one word was said, in either house, on the subject of attempting to christianize our native subjects in India.

The same silence was observed in 1781, when an act passed for narrowing the powers of the Supreme Court of Judicature; at that period indeed it was a declared *principle,* that we ought to preserve sacred and inviolate, the religion, laws, and customs of our native subjects.

In 1783, when Mr. Fox's celebrated bill passed the Commons, not one syllable was ut-

tered respecting the extension of Christianity in India.

In 1784, when Mr. Pitt's bill passed, which transferred the government of India from the Company to the Crown, not one word was uttered on the subject of evangelizing the natives of India.

In 1793, for the *first time* the subject was mentioned in Parliament—by Mr. Wilberforce in the Commons, and by the Bishop of London in the Lords, but the clauses were withdrawn by consent.

In that year it was, that the English Missionaries were *for the first time* sent to India. Were they sent by either of the venerable Societies of our Church? No. They were smuggled out in violation of the law, by a Sectarian Missionary Society instituted in 1792. It was from that Society, and from another Sectarian Society, instituted in 1799, but which did not send out a single Missionary until 1803, that this *new light* was obtained, by those of our Church who now seem to think that to attempt to evangelize our native subjects in India is an indispensible duty; and those of the Old School

who cannot discern this new light, or who think the attempt will be abortive and highly dangerous to the state, are deemed hostile to Christianity and its interests.

Whenever the *Church* of *England* declares its opinion, and even if it should become a convert to the Sectarian doctrine, it will I am sure have the candour not to impute improper motives to those who still adhere to the old school.

It is the misfortune of the Christian Observer sometimes to disagree, as the conductors say, with the Anti-Jacobin Review, though in this point they do agree. It is my fortune generally to coincide with the Anti-Jacobin Review, and cordially to approve their principles both as to Church and State, but on this point I may possibly differ from them when I can understand their meaning better than I do at present.

FINIS.

W. Flint, Printer,
Old Bailey.